

Dirt wipt off:

OR

A manifest Discovery of the Gross
Ignorance, Erroneousness and most Un-
christian and Wicked Spirit of one

JOHN BUNYAN,
LAY-PREACHER IN
BEDFORD.

Which he hath shewed in a Vile Pamphlet
Publish'd by him, against

The Design of Christianity.

Written for the disabusing of those poor deluded people
that are followers of him, and such like Teachers, and to
prevent their farther deluding of others, and poisoning them
with Licentious and destructive Principles.

2 Pet. 2. 12.


*But these as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed (or to
catch and corrupt) speak evil of the things that they understand not, &c.*

Prov. 18. 6, 7.

*A fools Lips enter into Contention, and his mouth calleth for strokes.
A fools mouth is his destruction, and his Lips are the snare of his Soul.*

L O N D O N,

Printed by R. N. for Richard Royston Book-seller to
His most Sacred Majesty. M DC LXXII.



Printed by T. W. for the Proprietor, at the
MIDLAND PRESS, 10, N. D. L. 1111.

THE
P R E F A C E
T O T H E
R E A D E R.

Reader,

I Think my self obliged to make my apology to thee for the writing and Publication of these Papers ; for I know thou wilt be tempted to wonder, how any one but of ordinary discretion could perswade himself to set his wit against so lamentable a piece of prond folly, and not disdain to defile his fingers with so very dirty a Creature as is the person I have to do with in the following sheets : and thou mayst also conclude, that I am ashamed to be seen so meanly employed by my concealing my name from thee : To deal openly and ingeniously, I never undertook business that went against the hair as this hath done, nor can I well more deny my self in any thing than in this Condescension : but the consideration, that there is something of necessity in the case, hath over-ruled me and brought down my spirit. Not that there is any thing, that this John Bunyan hath publisht against The Design of Christianity, that an intelligent Reader can otherwise entertain than with contempt and scorn ; but the intolerable insolence and naughtiness of the man, together with the weakness of those many poor Souls into whose good opinion he hath and may, to their infinite danger, insinuate himself,

The Preface to the Reader.

made it, in my opinion, a great piece of Charity to undertake this drudgery.

Drudgery I call it, not in regard of any difficulty there is in knowing what to reply, for there was never in this world an easier province; but because 'tis an exceeding hard task to satisfy ones self what not to reply: For I profess most unfeignedly, that I never knew any one so expose himself, nor give his Adversaries so many advantages of discovering his shameful ignorance, Erroneousness, dishonesty and base nature, as he in that book hath done. And therefore I add too, that the mere reading it over cannot but be a very great pain to any understanding and good spirited person.

I say 'tis the pity I have for deluded people, and my great desire to prevent an increase of their number, as also, if it be possible, to make this poor man sensible of his folly and wickedness, that have prevailed with me to set a-part a few dayes for this employment. For, though I have I must acknowledg, a particular kindness for Mr. Fowler and his Book (both which he hath in the grossest manner imaginable calumniated and abused) yet my mere concern for the one or other should never have occasioned one line from me; it being as impossible for such a thing as he to disgrace either the writings or Person of Mr. F. by all his railings; as it is for the like rude creatures to eclipse the Moon by barking at her, or to make Palaces contemptible by their lifting up their legs against them. Nay, for my part, I should think my self most effectually disparaged, should any body tell me that this man prais'd me, and thereupon should ask that Question of Socrates

The Preface to the Reader.

Socrates upon the like account, what evil have I done?

But not to detain thee with a larger Preface than is necessary, the remaining part shall consist of but little more than two or three requests to the followers of this J. B. and of such like Teachers.

1. *I desire that those of you that shall meet with this Pamphlet, would put yourselves to the very little trouble of reading it over, and that with as little prejudice as well you can; and then if you can but give credit to your own eyes, you must needs be convinced that this person (as able and godly as you may now think him) doth scarcely excel the most foolish in any thing but prodigious pride and boldness, and men of the most wicked Spirits in nothing but a vain-glorious shew & form of godliness. I would not for all the world so positively affirm such things of any one, if they were not as self evident, as that twice Ten make Twenty, and what I have now laid to his charge, you must necessarily acknowledge to be as manifest to sense, as is that proposition by that time you have read but one half of this Pamphlet. And for this reason I also desire you to read it over, namely, because your judgments may be thereby greatly rectified in the doctrine of the Gospel, if you will consider what you read.*

2. *I entreat you that, as you love your Souls, you will not for the future suffer your selves to be gul'd and cheated by mere noise and Confidence; you are not so imprudent about the concerns of your frail bodies or perishing estates, as to make use of that man for your Physician or Lawyer, whose ignorance and dishonesty you have but the tenth part of that proof of, that you have here given you of this John Bunyan's: And is*

it

The Preface to the Reader.

it not a miserable thing, that you should be in nothing so rash and unaccountably foolish, as in the matters that relate to your eternal welfare?

3. If this man shall have the face to say any thing by way of reply, (as what may not be expected from such a forehead) I entreat you to compare what he saith with what I have here proposed to your view, and be not so weak and easie of belief, as to think he hath done himself the least service, if he answers not punctually to the particulars of the charge of gross ignorance, errorousness, dishonesty, and a most unchristian spirit, that I have here exhibited against him. No doubt but the infinite concern that he hath for his credit among you, (which he must needs now conclude to be in eminent danger) will prompt him to make as plausible a tale for himself, as his together with his Brethrens inventions can possibly devise; but, I say, be sure to compare his defence with the things in these Papers laid to his charge, and I'll warrant you, you shall be confirmed thereby in an ill opinion of him, as much as by any thing any Adversary of his can write against him.

And lastly, I would desire this J. B. himself to take notice, that Mr. Fowler is much more profitably employed than to have leisure to return answers to his wretched Scribbles, but if he had time lying upon his hands, he will not easily be perswaded to do such bald & rude scriblers so great an honor. But if any one that is able to write sense, and to do any thing like a Scholar or man, will be dealing with him, such a one may be certain that, as busie as he is, he will find him work. But he will not have so little a regard for his repute with discreet and understanding persons, as to give himself


The Preface to the Reader.

himself leave to be in the least concerned at the brutish barkings of such a Creature as this, though it lies not in his power to hold the Pens of others from returning upon him. If you wonder, Reader, that I should use such an expression as brutish barkings, do but turn to the Catalogue I have given you of some, and but some of his most scurrilous and vile language at the end of this Pamphlet, and there see at what a rate he raves at Mr. F. and his Treatise, (whose only business it is to promote holiness ; and for which reason it hath had as general a good acceptance with pious and good people, as most books I have known,) I say, do but turn to that Catalogue, and then thou wilt acknowledg that I might have said devillish contumelies instead of brutish barkings, and not have fouled my Pen with unseemly words.

But to conclude, whereas Mr. F. is now upon the publishing of an excellent Scripture Catechism, composed by a Learned and very worthy Person now deceased, when that is Printed, if I can perswade him, he shall send this J. B. one of them, which he infinitely more needs than he doth an answer ; For though he impudently takes upon him to be a Teacher of others, he hath need that one teach himself which be the first principles of the Oracles of God ; And besides, Mr. F. cannot desire that the doctrine of his Design of Christianity should be better defended than, to my knowledg, any man may do it by the assistance of that Catechism.

Farewel.

The Preface to the Reader.



IMPRIMATUR.

Tho. Tomkyns.

Ex Æd.

Lambethanis.

Sept. 10.

1672.



ERRATA.

PAge 18. last Line: adde in effect. p. 19. l. 3. for justifies
read intitles. p. 19. l. 33. for almost r. at most. p. 22. l.
11. for as r. than. p. 28. l. 24. add on. p. 29. l. 27. for in r. is.
p. 32. l. 3. & 4. for where he said 'tis r. where 'tis said.

Courteous Reader,

*These and other Faults have been occasioned through the Au-
thors absence, and by the hasty Printing of this Treatise, which
thou art desired both for thy own sake and for his, to correct with
thy Pen, before thou settest thy self to the serious reading
thereof.*



DIRT WIP'T OFF:

O R

A manifest discovery of the Gross Ignorance and most Unchristian and Wicked Spirit of one

JOHN BUNYAN.

OF all the mischievous things that poor mortals are or ever were infested with, there is scarcely any one comparable to Ignorant Fanatick zeal; nor are there to be found in nature so implacably spiteful and cruel Creatures, as those that are acted by *this* Fury. And as she hath produced unspeakably Sad and dismal Effects in this our once too too happy Church and State, and in innumerable other places; so the most horrid impieties that ever the Sun saw, have received their birth from *her* Womb. It was *this* Zeal that hurried those Proud and ill-natur'd Religionists the *Pharisees* on all those horrible affronts and indignities, that they offered to and heapt upon the Lord of Glory; nor would it suffer them to rest, till it had made them his inhumane and most barbarous murtherers. And when

B

I

Dirt wip't off,

I consider this prodigious instance of the Wickedness of those Zealots, I cannot wonder at any Villanies, that I ever understand are acted by the people of *their* Spirit: Nor when we call to mind, how our most Blessed Saviour suffered both from their *tongues* and *hands*, because he preached such doctrine as did distaste their humor, and set himself against their corrupt opinions and practices; can we think it any other than what ought to be expected, that in all ages his faithful Ministers and Servants should meet with the same usage for therein following their Lords Example; and especially since he himself hath forewarned them, that they shall be no otherwise entertained by that Sort of men, than as he was. For (saith he *Matt. 10. 24.*) *The disciple is not above his Master, nor the Servant above his Lord, it is enough for the disciple that he be as his Master and the Servant as his Lord: if they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?* Again (*John 15. 20.*) *if they persecuted me, they will also persecute you.*

And among the many true Successors of the *Pharisees*, that among our selves do daily verifie those predictions, there are, I have reason to believe, none whose breasts are fuller of rancour and malice, towards those that are industrious, not to make Converts to *Sects* but to *Christ Jesus*, and to propagate not the *fancies of men*, but the *genuine doctrines of the Gospel*, than is the breast of the man that hath occasioned the publication of this Pamphlet, viz. *John Bunyan*, a person that hath been near these twenty years or longer, most infamous in the Town and County of *Bedford*, for a very Pestilent Schismatick.

Never did any more cry out of Persecution, nor inveigh against others as Persecutors, than he hath done; but in the mean time no one is of a fiercer and more persecuting Spirit than he himself. For besides that a slanderer is a cruel Persecutor (as doing what in him lies to deprive his brother of his good name, which in the Wise man's judgment is rather to be chosen than great riches, nay to a good man is deservedly
more

more precious than is life it self) such a one demonstrates that nothing but want of Power is the true cause, that he persecutes not by deeds as well as words ; Calumnies being ever taken up by impotent Creatures for want of sharper Weapons. And that this *J. B.* is a most Black-mouth'd Calumnjator, besides innumerable other evidences, his late Pamphlet, or rather *Libel*, intituled *A defence of the doctrine of Justification by Faith, &c.* will abundantly satisfy any person, that hath but the wit and honesty impartially to examine, how he attempts to make good what he therein hath charged against Mr. Fowler, viz. That he doth propagate, in his Treatise intituled *The Design of Christianity*, the Doctrine of Quakers, of Papists and Heathens, writes Blasphemy, is an Enemy to the Son of God and Salvation of the world, tramples under foot the blood of the Son of God, together with many the like dreadful and most horrid accusations ; which shall be presented together at the end of the Book to the Readers eye.

Before I go further, I must needs tell thee, *J. B.* Thou art a man of Metal, thou scornest, I perceive, to play at small game, to give thine Adversary some light Scratches, thou art for Neck or nothing. Thou hast a mouth for *MACHIAVIL'S* money, who hath taught such as thy self this rule, Fortiter Calumniare, &c. which (because thou hast little kindness for the Language of the Beast) take thus in English, slander lustily and something will stick. Thou couldst scarcely hope that any one that knows or hath but heard of Mr. F. (nay though he should be one of thine own herd) can find in his heart to think him such a Monster of men, such a Devil incarnate, as thou wouldst make him ; but yet, to be sure, thou concludest that all that don't think thee so will, at least, be suspicious that so loud and hideous an out-cry is not made for nothing, and that he hath written a too erroneous book, if not such a damnable heretical one, and therefore that 'tis dangerous to read it, and hear or converse with the Author of it.

But we will now consider what foundation is laid in that Treatise of Mr. F's, for this Fellow to build so black a charge on; and in order thereunto I shall not need to do any thing more, than give the Reader a short view of the Sum and Substance of the Doctrinal part of it, which I will do for the sake of those that are strangers to it. And I promise to do it with all sincerity and impartiality, and if I perform not, let me be stigmatized by any that shall compare the following account with the Book it self, for a man of no Conscience, and a most false person.

The whole Title of the Book is, *The Design of Christianity, or a plain demonstration and improvement of this proposition, that the induing men with inward real Righteousness or true Holiness was the Ultimate end of our Saviour's coming into the world, and is the great Intendment of his Blessed Gospel.* The business of the first Chapter is an Explication of the nature of true Holiness: wherein (after it is said to be by various forms of speech exprest in Scripture, such as *Godliness, Righteousness, Conversion and turning from Sin, Partaking of a Divine Nature, &c.* and that it is originally seated in the Soul and Spirit, and is a Complication of all vertues) there are four general and Comprehensive descriptions given of it: all which differ only in words, not at all in Sense. And they all amount to thus much (as any one of but a competent understanding will at first sight perceive) viz. *That true Holiness is such an inward living principle, as so far as it prevails, causeth the person that is indued with it to behave himself as becomes him (that is to avoid and hate whatsoever is any wayes known to be morally evil, and to love and prosecute whatsoever is good) or to be under the government of all those good practical principles or Laws, which are made known either by Revelation (that is by the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament) or by Nature or the use of Reason.*

When Holiness is called a *healthful complexion of Soul, &c.*
the

the purity of the humane nature, &c. and a divine or Godlike nature, &c. there is no more said than what is included in this description.

Next, between the third and last description, there is a somewhat more express and distinct account of the nature of Holiness; but this I shall have occasion hereafter to take notice of.

In the close of this Chapter it is said, that nothing is more natural to the Souls of men as they came out of God's hands, than this excellent temper, but by their Apostasie from God and sinking into brutish sensuality, they sadly dispossessed themselves of it, and so became like the beasts which perish; but it pleased God in infinite goodness not to give us over so, but, when we had destroyed our selves, in him was our help found, and in order thereunto he sent his only begotten Son to us.

The Second Chapter is spent in proving that the great errand Christ came upon was, to put us again into possession of that holiness which we had lost: and this is proved by a Climax of seven particulars, all which are implied in these Scriptures, which I entreat the Reader to turn to *Matt. 3. 1, 2. and Luke 1. 16, 17. Mal. 3. 1, 2, 3. Matt. 1. 21. Luke 1. 72, &c. Luke 2. 32. Matt. 3. 11, 12. Matt. 9. 13. Matt. 5. 17. Acts 3. 26. Acts 5. 31. 1 John 3. 8. Titus 2. 12. 1 John 3. 5.*

In the third Chapter is shewn, that holiness is the only design, (*that is, in reference to us*) of the Christian Precepts; and 'tis particularly shewn that they require, 1. The most extensive holiness; that is, such as respects God, our Neighbour and our selves. 2. The most intensive, not only negative but positive, (*that is, not only such as consists in doing no evil, but also in doing good*) not only holiness of words and actions, but likewise of thoughts and affections, not only such a holiness as puts upon performing good actions, but also.

also such as puts upon performing them in a right manner, with right ends, or from good principles, causing us to do every duty as to the Lord and not as to men, to do all to the glory of God, &c.

Lastly, this Chapter concludes with the answer of an Objection: The Objection is, that all sober Christians acknowledge, that the Gospel precepts do not require indefective and unspotted holiness, or at least that Christ will accept of that which is far short of perfect, and therefore he seems not to be so great a friend to it as is asserted.

The Answer is that, 1. The attainment of perfect holiness is in this state impossible to us. 2. That Christ will accept of nothing short of sincerity, and diligent serious endeavours to abstain from all Sin. 3. That no less than our absolutely perfect holiness is designed by Christ, though not to be effected in *this* yet in the *other* world.

The Fourth Chapter sheweth that the promises and Threatnings of the Gospel have the promoting of holiness for their only design. That the promises have, 'tis proved from 2 Pet. 1. 4. 2 Cor. 7. 1. Rom. 12. 1. And 'tis further shewed, that 1. These promises are either limited to holy persons, or made use of as motives to holiness; as 1 Tim. 4. 8. Matt. 5. 8. v. 3, 5, 7. Rom. 2. 7. Rev. 3. 21. ch. 2. 20. And whereas the promises of pardon and Eternal life are made to *believing*, 'tis said that nothing is more evidently declared, than that this faith is such as purifieth the heart, and is productive of good works. 2. 'Tis shewed that the *Nature* of these Promises is such as is alone sufficient to satisfy us, that holiness is the design of them. This, 'tis shewed, is manifestly true concerning the principal promises, which are reduced to 3 heads, 1. That of the holy Spirit. 2. Of Remission of sin. 3. Of Eternal happiness in the enjoyment of God. For the first, viz. the promise of the Spirit, that, 'tis said, is it to which we are beholden for grace and assistance in the great work

work of subduing sin and acquiring holy habits. And for the Second and Third, none but holy Souls are capable of them. None are capable, but *such*, of Pardon of sin; because the *guilt*, 'tis shewn, and the *Power* of Sin are inseparable, and that sin is so loathsome and filthy a thing, that 'tis impossible the blood of Christ should render a sinner lovely or not-odious in God's sight, any otherwise than by *first* washing away the pollution of it. Lastly, that none but holy Souls are capable of the *Enjoyment of God*, is proved from 2 Cor. 6. 14. Col. 1. 12.

And as for the Promises, that concern the good things of *this* life, it is shewn that only such are assured by them as may be a help to the exercise of holiness, not such as serve to gratifie sensuality or licourish appetites.

And then as to the *Threatnings* of the Gospel, 'tis proved, that they are no where made use of for any other end, than to scare men from what doth tend to pollute their Souls, and to excite them effectually to industry in the pursuit of real righteousness and substantial holiness.

In the Fifth Chapter is shewed, that the promoting of holiness was the design of our Saviours whole *life* and *conversion* among men. 1. Of his discourses: not only his *Sermons*, but also those that *occasionally* dropt from him. 2. Of his *Actions*, whereby he preacht holiness to mens *Eyes*, no less than to their ears, by giving them the most stupendious Example in his own person of all the parts of it; whereof these instances are given. 1. He was a person of the greatest *Freedom*, *Affability* and *Courtesie*. 2. Of the greatest *Candor* and *Ingenuity*. 3. Of the greatest *Gentleness* and *Meekness*. 4. Of the most profound *Humility*. 5. Of the most *generous* Spirit, which discovered it self in the greatest *Contempt* of the world. 6. Of the most *contented* Spirit. 7. Of the greatest *Charity* and most tender *Compassion*. 8. Of the most wonderful *Patience*, and stupendious submission of Soul to God. 9. Of the most passionate *Love* to God, and devout

vout temper of mind towards him. 10. Of a mighty confidence and trust in God. 11. Of the greatest Prudence.

In the Sixth Chapter is shewed, that to make men truly vertuous and holy was the design of Christs *unimitable* actions, or *mighty works* and *Miracles*: And that these did not only tend to promote it, as they were convincing arguments that he came forth from God, but were also very proper to effect it in a more immediate manner.

The Seventh shews, that this was the design of his *death*; which is proved by these Scriptures, *Rom. 6.6. 2 Cor. 5. 15. Gal. 1.4. Eph. 5. 25, 26, 27. Col. 1. 21, 22. Titus 2. 14. 1 Pet. 1. 18. 1 Pet. 3. 18. 1 Pet. 2. 24.* Next, the death of Christ is proved effectual to this End; 1. As it gave testimony to the truth of his doctrine: 2. As the shedding of his blood was a federal rite confirming the New Covenant, wherein is promised in and through him pardon of Sin, and Eternal happiness on condition of Repentance, Faith and New obedience. 3. As 'tis exemplary of the highest virtue, particularly, of the greatest *humility, Self-denial, meekness, Patience and Charity*. 4. As it was a Sacrifice for sin; where 'tis shewn, that in the death of Christ, considered as an expiatory Sacrifice, the offence God hath taken against Sin, and the hatred he bears to it, as well as his love to Sinners, is infinitely declared. 5. As Christ hath by his death procured that *grace and assistance* for us that is necessary to enable us to be in all respects holy. 6. As his death doth vindicate God's right of Sovereignty over his Creatures, and the power he hath to require what he pleaseth of them, and to dispose of them as seems good to him. *Did ever man speak higher concerning the effects of Christs death, and precious blood-shedding, than Mr. F. hath in this Chapter done? Is this the talk of one that trampleth under foot the blood of the Son of God?*

In Chapter the Eighth is shewn, that it is only the promoting of the design of making men holy that is aimed at, by the Apostles insisting on the doctrines of Christ's *Resurrection*, *Ascension*, and coming again to Judgment, *That is, the only use which they make of them as to us, is to make them motives to all holiness of heart and life.*

The SECOND SECTION sheweth upon *what accounts* the business of making men holy came to be preferred by our Saviour before any other thing, and to be principally designed by him; and the Ninth Chapter (which is the first of that Section) giveth this first account, *viz.* That this is to do the greatest good to men. And 'tis proved by several Arguments, that the blessing of making men holy is of all other the greatest; as 1. Because it contains a deliverance from the worst of Evils, *viz. Sin*, and this is proved so to be, and that those are utterly ignorant of the nature of it, that imagine any evil greater than *it*, or so great.

The Tenth Chapter is spent in proving by a Second Argument, that holiness is the greatest of all blessings, *viz.* Because it is ever accompanied with other blessings that are most desirable, and do best deserve that name; particularly with the *Pardon* of Sin, and God's *Special love*: And that those things that *Sensual* persons are most desirous of, are eminently to be found in that blessing: As Riches, it is shewed that nothing doth enrich a man like the graces of God's holy Spirit; Secondly Honours; Thirdly Pleasures: where 'tis proved that both these result from true holiness, and that no other are comparable to those that do so.

The Eleventh Chapter prosecutes a Third Argument, *viz.* Because whatsoever other blessings a man may be supposed to have, that is utterly destitute of true holiness, they cannot stand him in so much stead as but to make him *not-miserable*.

And Sinful lusts are here proved to be most tormenting things in their own nature; and that therefore if we could suppose a wicked man to be made an object of God's pardon, it could signifie no more than an exemption from being immediately by him punished; and though the divine Majesty should not in the least afflict him, his very lusts would be of themselves no light punishment, but such as under which he could never enjoy himself in *this* life, but will be found to be *intolerable in the life to come*. And for the same reason 'tis shewn that were it possible that *Christs Righteousness* could be imputed to *such* a man, it would signifie as little to his happiness, while he *continueth* wicked, as would a gorgeous and splendid garment to one that is almost starv'd with hunger, or that lieth rackt by the torturing diseases of the Stone or Cholicke. And moreover, that wickedness makes men incapable even of those Effects of the *Divine Benevolence* and *Complacency*, that would render them but *not-miserable*, and therefore could we suppose a wicked man the object of both these, (as 'tis said that nothing is less supposeable than that he should be an object of the latter) this could not make him, whilst he *continues* wicked, to cease to be miserable. And lastly, if our phantasies were so powerful, as that they could place a wicked man in *Heaven* it self, so long as he continueth unturned from his iniquities, he would carry a hell to heaven with him, and keep it there; and that 'tis not the *place* Heaven, without the heavenly *state* that will make men happy; as a diseased body will have never the more ease for residing in a Princes Court. And in the conclusion of this Chapter it is asserted, that deliverance of a man from all misery while sin is vigorous in his Soul, is not an object of any power, and implieth a palpable and apparent Contradiction; misery being no less of the Essence of Sin and wickedness, than is light of the Sun, so that they cannot be separated, but must like the Twins of *Hippocrates*, live and dye together.

The *Twelfth* Chapter contains the Fourth Argument, *viz.* Holiness is the greatest of Blessings, because when 'tis perfected

fect'd 'tis *Blessedness* it self, and the glory of heaven doth chiefly consist in it : This proved out of 1 *John* 3. 2. *This we know, that when he appears we shall be like him,* that is chiefly in holiness; for as for God's attributes of *knowledge* and *Power*, &c, 'tis said that the Devils themselves, who are most of all Creatures unlike to God, have not lost all likeness to him in them, but have still a large measure of them. *By the way observe that J. B. puts this among Mr. F's. Doctrines destructive of Christianity, but who that believes there are such Creatures as Devils, especially having read what the Scripture saith of them, did ever doubt it?*

But to proceed, it is in this Chapter plainly shewn, that the perfection of holiness and the Heavenly happiness are for substance one and the same, and therefore it may well be affirmed, that the making us holy is the ultimate end of Christ's coming (*as to us that is,*) seeing our Eternal Salvation is by all acknowledged so to be; and perfect holiness and Eternal Salvation are but two Conceptions of one and the same thing; Eternal Salvation being *primarily* a Salvation from Sin, all Sin; and a Salvation from *misery* as 'tis a Salvation from the *Cause* of it.

The *Thirteenth Chapter* gives the second account of our Saviours preferring the business of making men holy before all other, *viz. that* as this is to do (as hath been shewn) the greatest good to men; so is it also to do the best Service to God; where 'tis said, that 'tis without dispute better Service to a Prince to reduce Rebels to their obedience, than to procure a Pardon under his Seal for them; and that Christ, loving his Father better than *us*, must needs more concern himself for the recovery of the right of Obedience, than Sinners have rob'd him of, than for the deliverance of wretched Rebels from the misery they have deserved, but that both these works are carried on together.

And in the close of this Second Section 'tis shewn, that those that say that the Christian Religion designeth to glorifie the infinite grace of God in Christ to Sinners, if they under-

stand what they say, do assert the same thing that this Book asserts: Seeing that not only the grace of God is so abundantly displayed in the Gospel to Sinners, for this end that they may be effectually prevailed with to forsake their Sins, but also the principal grace that is therein exhibited doth consist in delivering them from the Power of Sin; which appears, in that Sin is demonstrated to be in its own nature the very greatest of Evils, and holiness the chiefest of all Blessings: And besides, men are not capable of God's pardoning grace, till they have repented them of all their Sins, that is, (as it there follows these words) till they have in will and affection sincerely left them. And to justify a wicked man, while he continueth so, would far more disparage his justice and holiness, than advance his grace and kindness; viz. *Because to deal with a man living in wickedness as if he were righteous, would be an Argument that he doth not hate Sin, as he declares he doth.*

Thus Reader I have faithfully given thee the Substance of the Doctrinal part of the Design of Christianity; the Third and last Section is spent in improving that whole discourse in most evident Inferences: and now my hand is in, I'll be better than my word, and very briefly tell thee what they are.

The first Inference: chap. 14. That it appears from the past discourse, that our Saviour hath taken the most effectual course for the purpose of subduing Sin in us, and making us partakers of his Holiness: where 1. It is largely shewn what mighty and infinite advantages the Gospel gives above any, that even those Heathens had who were privileged with extraordinary helps for the improvement of themselves. And if the Reader will run over that discourse he shall perceive, how wickedly J. B. hath slander'd Mr. F. in accusing him as levelling Christianity with mere Heathenism.

2. 'Tis fully shewn that the Gospel contains incomparably greater helps for the effecting of the design of making men holy, than any God's people the Israelites were favoured with.

with. Then follows a threefold answer to an objection against the wonderful efficacy of the Christian Religion for this purpose, chap. 16.

The Second Inference, chap. 17. That we understand from what hath been said of the Design of Christianity, how fearfully 'tis abused by those that call themselves the *Roman Catholics*. *This Chapter will soon inform thee, Reader, what a friend Mr. F. is to Popery, and make thee believe if thou hast any charity, that no man under heaven doth more abominate it, than he does.*

The Third Inference, chap. 18. That these two sorts are most extremely Sottish; 1. Such as expect to have their share in the Salvation of the Gospel without true holiness. 2. Such, much more, as encourage themselves by the grace of the Gospel in unholiness.

The Fourth Inference, chap. 19. That a right understanding of the design of Christianity will give satisfaction concerning the notion, 1. Of justifying Faith, *viz. That it is such a belief of the truth of the Gospel, as includes a sincere resolution of obedience unto all its precepts, that is true holiness; and that it justifieth as it doth so: where it is added, that the Faith that justifieth must needs be such as complyeth with all Christs purposes of coming into the world, but especially, with his grand purpose; and that 'tis necessary it should justify as it receives Christ for a Lord, as well as for a Saviour: Nay, especially when in this matter there is but a notional difference between these two; it having been shewn that Christ as a Saviour designs our holiness: his Salvation being chiefly that, from the worst of Evils, sin.*

Canst thou think, *Reader*, that Mr. F. deserves to be accused as Popishly affected in this point? Are all those Papists in the Doctrine of justification that deny a *dead Faith* to be the condition of it? and doth not S. *James* say that Faith
without

without works is dead: And if a living Faith justifies, is it Popery to say that it justifies as 'tis a *living* Faith? I am sure 'tis non-sense to say otherwise. Doth Mr. F. any where, contrary to the Apostle *Paul*, assert the *merit* of Works? no, he makes *works* or a *working* Faith, only a necessary condition of justification, as S. *James* doth, and all the *Apostles*, and *Christ* alone to be the *meritorious* cause of it: And he must needs attribute our justification to the free grace of God in *Christ*, when he makes also the condition of it *Faith* a free gift, a grace of God's holy Spirit. In short, let the Reader consult Mr. F's *Free Discourse between two intimate Friends*, p. 149. to p. 190. and there he shall see his full sense of justifying Faith, and the notion given *there* of it sufficiently defended.

2. The other notion, Mr. F. in this inference saith the Design of Christianity will give satisfaction concerning, is, *that of the imputation of Christ's Righteousness, viz.* That it consists in dealing with *sincerely* righteous persons, as if they were *perfectly so*, for the sake and upon the account of *Christ's Righteousness*. And he shews, that the Doctrine of the Design of Christianity makes it impossible, that any other notion of this point should have truth in it. But mark what he saith in the close; *But because both these Points are discussed in the Free Discourse, I have said so little of the former, and will proceed no farther on this; but refer the Reader thither, &c.* Would any one now have imagined, but that this J. B. (had he the least spark of ingenuity, or meant at all honestly) would have taken occasion to inform himself thoroughly from that Discourse concerning Mr. F's judgment, in these two points especially, and to try the strength of the arguments, whereby he *there* hath confirmed his Doctrine; and if he had been sagacious enough to espy flaws in them, to make a discovery of them; but he takes no more notice of that Book than if there had been none such extant, nay, though Mr. F. doth several times in the Design of Christianity refer to it.

This

This is the Blade that loves to tell the world, *he is a lover of Truth*, but if she hath no sincerer friends than he makes it apparent, by this and all his other practices, he is, her case would be most deplorable. All that understand this man may safely conclude, that he hath as little *will* as *ability* to find out, and acquaint himself with this precious Jewel. *But to the next Inference.*

The Fifth Inference, chap. 20. That we learn from the Design of Christianity what is the great measure and standard whereby we are to judge of Doctrines; both whether they are true or false, and in what degree necessary to be received or rejected.

The Sixth Inference, chap. 22. That the Design of Christianity teacheth us what Doctrines and Practices we ought, as Christians, to be most zealous for or against. Those surely, that are most available to the begetting and increase of true holiness, it is our duty to be most concerned for, and those that have the greatest tendency towards the endangering of it, to set our selves with the greatest industry against.

The Seventh Inference, chap. 23. That the Design of Christianity well considered will give us great light into the just bounds of our Christian liberty: And that *that* being to make men holy, it may safely be presumed that such things as have neither directly nor consequentially any tendency to the depraving our souls, are left free to us by our Saviour. And 'tis shewn that this is only to be understood of such things as the Gospel speaks nothing particularly and clearly concerning.

The Eighth Inference, chap. 24. That 'tis a most unaccountable thing to do that which is essentially evil, in defence of the Christian Religion, or of any opinions presumed to be Doctrines relating thereunto. *I would J. B. would well lay to heart this, I am sure if he had done so when he read it, there would have been no occasion for these leaves.* The

The Ninth Inference, chap. 25. That 'tis most unwarrantable for the Ministers of Christ to prefer any design before that of making men really righteous and holy.

The Tenth Inference, chap. 26. That an obedient temper of mind is an excellent and necessary qualification to prepare men for a firm belief and right understanding of Christ's Gospel.

The Last Inference, chap. 27. That we are taught by the Design of Christianity, wherein the Essence, Power, and life of it consisteth, viz. in a holy frame and temper of soul, whereby it esteemeth God as the chiefest good, preferreth him and his Son Jesus before all the world, and prizeth above all things an Interest in the Divine perfections, such as justice and righteousness, universal Charity, Goodness, Mercy, Patience, and all kinds of purity: From whence doth naturally proceed a hearty compliance with all the holy Precepts of the Gospel, and sincere endeavours to perform all those actions which are agreeable to them, are necessary expressions of those and the like virtues, and means for the obtaining and encrease of them.

What thinkest thou now, Reader, canst thou fancy the Design of Christianity to be another Leviathan? or rather art thou able to retain any *tolerable* opinion of that man that calls it so, and represents it as such a piece of monstrous Devilism? Nay, can he himself have such a Brazen Forehead, as not to be confounded to think what he hath done, upon his reading over (if he can be perswaded to it) but this short account of that Treatise? I pray God give him true Repentance, and set home upon his Conscience what hath, and shall be farther laid open to his view in this small Pamphlet: which if ever he does, I am sure he'll acknowledge that Mr. F. hath given him as little temptation to accuse him so highly, as did
our

our blessed Saviour the malicious *Pharisees* to fasten upon him the imputation of as fearful crimes, viz. profane company keeping, Treason, witchcraft and Blasphemy. And who can be so blind as not to see, that the only provocation *I. B.* could have to exclaim at such a rate is this, that the design of Mr. *F.*'s book is utterly to root out that doctrine which is the grand support of wretched hypocrites, and which doth infinitely disparage our Blessed Lord Jesus and his glorious Gospel: I mean that filthy doctrine of Antinomianism, with which this man hath stuffed his sad Scribble; and it appears not only by that but by his other lamentable writings, that he is as rank and Ranting an Antinomian as ever foul'd paper.

I concluded as soon as I had read the Design of Christianity (which no man hath done more deliberately or impartially than my self) that it would be a very acceptable work to Sincere Souls; but on the other side, as welcome to all hardened hypocrites, as our Saviours Sermon on the Mount to the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*. I knew it would make such gnash their teeth, and that the Author would be an object of their Spight and rage; but I must confess I could not in the least imagine, that any one that would be thought a Christian had so little concern for his reputation, as so shamelessly to lay open his hypocrisy to the sight of all men, as by printing such fearful stuff as this *I. B.* hath done.

In the first place he sets down a Catalogue of the Errors and Doctrines destructive of Christianity, that he saith Mr. *F.* hath presented to the world in his (as he calls it) Feigned Design, &c. And that it might make a huge shew, he puts it upon the tenter hooks to make it contain so round a number as just forty. And 'tis worth our observation, that in order to the making of it so bulky a thing as he does, he useth this honest Art, (as any one will see that reads his long bed-roul with the least attention, namely, he makes in abundance of instances distinct doctrines of different expressions, and proofs, and illustrations of one and the same thing. As (in the first place) the sixth damnable wicked doctrine he chargeth on Mr. *F.* is,

That Christ's grand coming into the world was to put us again into possession of that holiness that we had lost. Design of Christianity page 12. The seventh, That John the Baptist, the Angel sent to Zacharias and Mary (which is his own addition) and Malachi preached this doctrine. p. 13. The eighth, That by Christ's saving us from Sin, is meant not first his saving us from the punishment of it, &c. p. 14, 15. Mark, by the way, that what he refers to here is only two or three words, by which the proof out of Malachi of the same thing is explained. The nineteenth, That the Salvation of Christ first consists in curing our wounds, and secondarily in freeing us from the smart. p. 216. The Twentieth, That pardon doth not so much consist in remission as in healing. p. 216. Note, this is not Mr. F's saying but only a saying of the Ancient Father Clemens of Alexandria quoted by him. The 29th. That the grand intent of the Gospel is to make us partakers of inward real righteousness, and it is but a Secondary one that we should be accepted and rewarded as if we were completely righteous. p. 226.

The 30th. That it is not possible that any other notion of this doctrine should have a truth in it p. 226. I. B. himself cannot be so blind as not to be able to see, that all these seven amount to one and the same thing.

Again, the 12th. Error is, That it is impossible a wicked man should have God's pardon. p. 119. That is, as Mr. F. explain'd himself, he continuing wicked,

The 13th. That 'tis impossible Christ's Righteousness should be imputed to an unrighteous man. p. 120. That is, he continuing unrighteous.

The 14th. That if it were, it would signify as little to his happiness while he continueth so, as would a gorgeous and splendid garment to one that is almost starved. p. 120.

The 15th. That for God to justify a wicked man &c. would far more disparage his justice and holiness, than advance his grace and kindness. p. 130.

The 16th. That men are not capable of God's pardoning grace till they have truly repented them of all their Sins. p. 130.

Who that hath eyes in his head doth not see, that these are all the same.

Once

Once more, The 21st. pretended error is, *That Faith justifies as it includes true holiness in the nature of it.* p. 221.

The 22^d. *That the Faith, that justifies a Sinner to so high a privilege as that of justification, must needs be such as complyeth with all the purposes of Christ's coming into the world, and especially with his grand purpose; and 'tis no less necessary that it should justify as it doth this.* p. 222.

The 23^d. *That he wonders that any worthy man should be so difficultly perswaded to embrace this account of justifying Faith.* p. 222. A special doctrine this doth he know what the word [doctrine] means that makes this one?

The 24th. *That there can be no pretence for a man to think that Faith should be the condition or instrument of justification, as it complyeth with only the precept of relying on Christ's merits for the obtaining of it.* p. 223.

The 25th. *That it is as clear as the Sun at noonday, that Obedience to the other precepts must go before Obedience to this.* p. 223.

The 26th. *That, he shall be his Apollo that can give him a sufficient reason, why justifying Faith should consist in recumbency and relying on Christ's merits for the pardon of Sin.* p. 224.^a This another special doctrine. And anon his foul dishonesty in this shall be discovered.

The 27th. *That, he will take the boldness to tell those who are displeased with this account of justifying Faith, that in his opinion it is impossible they should think of any other.* p. 225. This a doctrine like the other two; which no one of common sense would call so.

Here are seven more of his Doctrines that are all the same, To which also may be added many more that are the very same, but I am weary of this work; and I think I have done fairly in transcribing these instances, whereby it is manifest that nineteen of his number are dwindled away into almost but a poor three. And by these let the Reader judge of the rest, or rather let him Examine and compare them himself, and he will find enough in all conscience of the same fair play; and be ready to take up his saying to the Shearer of the hogs: A GREAT CRY, BUT LITTLE WOOL.

Next after this doughty performance, our notable Muster-master of damnable doctrines thus accosts his Reader. Reader, *I have given thee here but a taste of these things, and by my Book but a brief reply to the errors, that he by his hath divulged to the world, although many more are by me reflected, than the Forty thou art here presented with.* But I must tell our honest John, that surely he never expected any other Readers than the most arrant Blockheads, or he (except he be so himself) would never have made them such a present. And whereas he saith, *he hath reflected many more*, to pass by the non-sense I will assure him, that after his rate of counting, if I may but have the honour to serve him in compleating his Catalogue, it should scape me hard but I would advance Mr. F's errors from so modest a number as *Forty* to at least *Four hundred*.

But I must have another remark upon this goodly Catalogue, namely, that *J. B.* hath very *falsly* represented, and more than so, *invented* Doctrines for Mr. *F.* which is the part of a marvellously honest man. As for instance;

1. What think you of his very first; namely, *That the first Principles of Morals, those first written in mens hearts are the essential, the indispensable and fundamental points of the Gospel.* For this he cites p. 8. 281, 282. But there is no such thing, and all that can be gathered thence is but this, that these are Fundamentals, and in p. 282. there is numbred with Righteousness, Charity, &c. the *preferring* God and Christ *Jesus* before all the world, and *this* is set before *those* too. But *J. B.* hath so worded this, as to make the Reader think that Mr. *F.* hath asserted so horrid a Doctrine, as that those are the *only* Fundamentals of the Gospel. But what Mr. *F.* doth assert, *J. B.* if he be in his wits, whatever he *thinks*, will not dare to deny.
2. The Second is like the First; viz. *That these first Principles are to be followed, principally as they are made known to us by the*

the dictates of humane nature; and that this obedience is the first and best sort of obedience that we Christians can perform. Observe 1. That this is non-sence, and no where written by Mr. F. he knows not what *dictates* mean that faith, that the first principles are made known by them; For they are the dictates of humane nature themselves. But 2. observe, what is far more unpardonable, that the whole is a pure forgery, consult the place he refers to, p. 8, 9, 10.

3. The Third, *That there is such a thing, as a soundness of soul, and the Purity of the humane nature in the world.* This he cites p. 6. for, but neither *there* or *elsewhere* is this asserted otherwise than thus, *That true holiness is the purity of the humane nature, and a sound Complexion of Soul;* now all that follows hence is, that where holiness is, there is purity of nature, &c. that is, in what degree soever a man is holy, his nature is pure: and doth not our Saviour intimate as much, when he calls holy men (and that on this side heaven too) pure in heart, *Matt. 5. 8.* what is the difference between purity of *Nature*, and purity of *heart*? But the vilest thing is this, that *J. B.* would by wording it thus make the Reader believe, that Mr. F. denies the corruption of nature; as will be seen anon.

4. The very next again is his pure invention, viz. *That the Law in the first Principles of it is more obliging on the hearts of Christians, than is that of coming to God by Christ,* p. 7, 8, 9, 10. Mr. F. abhors this doctrine, nor is there any thing in those or any other pages of his said to tempt any well-minded man to gather so wretched an Inference from it. The most that is said concerning *going to God by Christ* is but this, *that 'tis a duty enjoyed by a divine positive Law not by the law of nature;* and of all men I hope *J. B.* won't say it is, who (like a wofully ignorant Creature) so often speaks contemptuously of this Law. But because Mr. F. said some pages before, that the law of nature is of an eternal and indispensable obligation, but not positive laws, he fastens on him that wicked Doctrine;

Doctrine; whereas nothing more, so much as *seems* to follow from thence, than that, therefore God can dispense with our obedience to his positive laws, not that we are less obliged to obey them than the laws of nature, while they are in force; and I never knew any man in the world that ever questioned this.

Observe Reader, that this that he here so vilely abuseth Mr. F. in, he repeats innumerable times over in his Book, and 'tis one of the Blasphemies he chargeth on him; but how dares that man look God in the face that is no more tender of his Brothers reputation, as so without any ground to accuse him of the horridest of all wickednesses?

5. Again he invents the Tenth Error, viz. That Christ's fulfilling the Law for us, was by giving more perfect and higher instances of moral duties, than were before expressly given, p. 17. Doth not this man know that he hath put in these words [for us] and that Mr. F. did only repeat that of our Saviour, *I came not to destroy the Law but to fulfil it*; and then expounded that word *fulfil* by the word *perfect*, intimating that the Greek hath that signification; and adding in the margin that, in *Rom. 15. 19.* and *Col. 1. 25.* it is rendred to *preach fully*.

6. For another instance of his wicked dealing, take Error the 26. *That he shall be his Apollo that can give him a sufficient reason, why justifying Faith should consist in recumbency and relyance on Christ's merits for the pardon of Sins.* p. 224. observe here the most palpable knavery of this citation. 1. He sets down but one half of the Sentence. 2. The half he conceals is the principal; mark, this is Mr. F's whole saying; *He shall be my Apollo that can give me a sufficient reason, why justifying Faith ought only to consist in recumbency and relyance on Christ's merits for the Pardon of Sin, and not also on his power for the mortification of it*: Is not there a vast difference between this whole Sentence, and his clipt one? But 3. to make it sound yet more odiously he leaves the word, the

the principal word [only] out of that part he sets down. And he makes Mr. F. say, *he shall be his Apollo that can give a sufficient reason, why justifying faith should consist in reliance on Christ's merits*; when his saying is, *should ONLY consist in reliance on Christ's merits*. And canst thou think this, Reader, a wicked saying? 'Tis as wicked, as he that hath thus notoriously abused it is *honest*: what but a dear love of sin can make any one have a less value for that grace of God, that is through Christ discovered in *killing* it, than for that grace that is expressed in the pardon of it? And what but hypocrisy can persuade any man, that it is not as necessary a condition to our acceptance with God to trust in Christ's power for the *subduing* of our lusts, as in Christ's *merits* for the *forgiveness* of them.

Another instance of this mans insufferable baseness is to be found in his 28. Citation, out of p. 225. *The imputation of Christ's Righteousness consisteth in dealing with sincerely Righteous persons, as if they were perfectly so*; There my Gentleman stops with an &c. and leaveth out the main business. If you consult the place you'll find *this* the left-out-part of the Sentence [for the sake, and upon the account of Christ's Righteousness.] I do not remember whether he hath it right any where in the body of his Book, but if he hath it signifies little, for he knew well enough that, where *one* would read *through* (or any considerable part of) his Book, *very many* would read this Catalogue in the front of it, nor could he be ignorant how much it is his interest that the Reader should not see this part, and that he would bless himself that *J. B.* should be so shameless a Creature, as to reckon *that* up among Doctrines destructive of Christianity; and much more, that he would stand amazed to think, that Mr. F. should be accused as a Trampler under foot of the blood of the Son of God, (as he is in the very Title page) and an Idolizer of man's own Righteousness, when he asserts, that sincerely Righteous Persons are dealt with by God as if they were perfectly Righteous, for the sake of Christ's Righteousness.

For

8.

For one more Instance take Error the Fifth, which I heedlessly passed over, when I wrote the first Four, but 'tis time enough now to make *J. B.* most dearly repent of his fathering that doctrine on Mr. *F.* It is this: *The Precept of coming to God by Christ is in its own nature a thing indifferent and absolutely considered, neither good nor evil.* He knew how this would be entertained, and that every body that thought him but an indifferently honest man would cry out shame on the venter of such an assertion; and he in his book doth on every turn make a fearful out-cry with this doctrine, stopping his Ears, and crying, *Blasphemy! Blasphemy!* But what if Mr. *F.* hath no such passage in his whole Book? What is *J. B.* then? Reader, if he hath I'll be thy Bond-slave. • *J. B.* refers thee to p. 7, 8, 9. But (as was before said) all that is said of going to God by Christ is but *this*, that it is enjoined by a Divine Positive Law, and who ever said that it is enjoined by the moral Law? Now because Mr. *F.* two pages before saith, *that Positive Precepts are the declarations of the arbitrary will of God, whereby he restrains our liberty; for great and wise reasons, in things that are of an indifferent nature, and absolutely considered neither good nor evil;* he takes occasion from thence to Calumniate him by making him assert a Doctrine, which doth not so much as follow from any thing he hath written. What! because the objects of the Positive Precepts, or the things they Command, are said to be in themselves indifferent, &c. (which every body saith as well as Mr. *F.*) may it be inferred thence, that therefore any positive Precept is self is indifferent, and particularly that of coming to God by Christ; whose Skull is so thick as not to discern that this is mad arguing? Are Precepts and the Objects of them the same thing? But would the Reader know what is the worst consequence that follows from thence; I answer, not that any divine Precept can be in it self indifferent, much less that of going to God by Christ, 'tis Blasphemy I acknowledg most willingly, and so will Mr. *F.* too, to say it is; but *this* follows, that therefore going to God by Christ, considered without

out respect to God's command that we should do so, is of an indifferent nature ; and did ever any mortal deny this ? will *J. B.* himself say, that it would have been our duty to go to God by Christ, although he had never declared it to be his will that we should do so, although God had never ordained him to be our Mediator. And though God's ordaining that Christ should be so, was a declaration of his infinite Wisdom as well as goodness, yet dare any say that God was bound to it (that is before he had bound himself) and that God had been unwise, or unjust, and unholy, if he had not appointed Christ our Mediator ? But the duties of the law of Nature such as loving of God, Justice, Mercy, &c. these are such as it would disparage God's holiness to give men liberty to perform them or not. God cannot, that is, he cannot *will* to give us leave to be disobedient to him, to hate him or not to love him, to be unjust (that is to take away from another what is his, he not first altering the property and making it none of his) or to commit murder, that is, to kill our neighbour out of malice, &c. Contradictions are not objects of *any* Power, and 'tis the greatest of Contradictions that a Creature can be under no obligation to love and honour his Creator, &c. And therefore seeing God hath made his Son Jesus Christ our Mediator, and told us so, the law of Nature it self *now* commands us to go to God by him, because it commands us to obey God in all things, (nothing being more a natural dictate, than that God must be universally obeyed) but if God had done otherwise, if he had never signified it to be his Pleasure that Christ should mediate between him and us, no dictate of nature would have told us that we ought to go to God by him, nor could it have been our duty. I should be ashamed to insist so long upon so plain a thing, But I hope my Reader will excuse me, when he considers whom I deal with.

I now challenge this man to make one tittle more than what I have said of any thing Mr. *F.* hath written concerning *Going to God by Christ*, but *this* is no more than every man in his wits will readily assent to.

I also appeal to those that are most fond of this *J. B.* whether or no he does not most barbarously abuse *Mr. F.* in making such hideous clamours as he doth of his Blasphemous Doctrines, *and most of all of this?* I appeal even to the most prejudiced of all his profelytes, and desire them to take a measure of his *Conscience* and *Sincerity* by these doings. Most of the things I have laid to his charge you see are the plainest matters of fact, the truth of which any one will presently perceive that compares his representation of *Mr. F's.* Doctrines with the Book out of which he pretends he had them. But 'tis no wonder that he that casts such base Slurs on all Righteousness but what's *imputative* (as *J. B.* doth in abundance of places in his Book) should make any bones of these matters; yet I cannot but admire that so insolently proud a Creature as he is sam'd to be, should have no more concern for his own reputation, than to publish (*to call a Spade, a Spade*) such manifest and apparent *lies*. God keep us from that Religion that gives liberty to such things as these.

Thus, Reader, I have given thee, I think thou wilt say, a sufficient taste both of this mans gross ignorance, and unchristian Spirit, and I assure thee I have remarkt upon nothing in his account of *Mr. F's.* Doctrines destructive of Christianity, but what obviously occurred to me, but I'll warrant thee if, (when thou hast nothing else to do) thou'lt consider them thy self, thou wilt find that I have left thee scope enough for more discoveries of *J. B's.* honesty and ingenuity.

And who now sees not, that the Holy Scriptures themselves cannot be secure from being charged with a great number of impious and blasphemous expressions by this presumptuous man, should his impudence once rise so high as to deal by them, as he hath done by the Sayings of *Mr. F.* Indeed to serve their own turns of them, neither he (as I can largely shew) nor others like him, do stick at so serving the Sacred Oracles; and no body can warrant us that they shall never be so fearfully audacious, as to make use of the same wicked arts to render *them* as hateful to the world, as they endeavour to make

make those pious books and men, that discover the extreme naughtiness of their Principles and Practices. The Apostle hath told us, *that Evil men and Seducers shall wax worse and worse*, and, if so, God alone can tell us where they shall stop.

If any Reader now expects that I should next proceed to examine the book it self, I must tell him I have done enough in all reason to make him perceive without farther assistance, how *J. B.* from the beginning to the end hath bewrayed his ignorance and dishonesty.

For though he pretends to have confuted effectually the Doctrines he so rageth against, this is the Sum of his whole performance.

1. Spitting his venome at them all in general.
2. Urging wofully silly arguments against several of them.
3. Wretchedly misrepresenting many of them: putting them into Bears Skins and then rudely baiting them.
4. Making Doctrines for *Mr. F.* which he never dream'd of: Setting up men of Straw and then fighting with them.
5. Exclaiming and raving at the most horrible rate against *Mr. F's* Person.
6. Intermixing a many non-sensical and wicked opinions of his own.
7. Running over and over innumerable times the very same things.

Now for the First, Fifth, Sixth, I will give more than a taste of them together in the close of all.

And as for the Seventh, viz. *his running over and over the very same things*, it cannot be expected that I should do any more than desire the Reader, if he won't believe me, to receive satisfaction from his own eyes.

So that it may be thought there remains now to shew the Second, Third and Fourth, but the Third and Fourth I have already shewn sufficiently in too many instances for his credit, and a great part of his Pamphlet is founded upon those very inventions and misrepresentations of his that have been dis-

covered; and for the Second, *viz.* the arguments he urgeth against several of Mr. F's Doctrines they are so miserably silly, that they deserve not to have one line bestowed upon them.

But yet because I will chuse rather to offend on the *right* than on the *left* hand, I will as briefly as may be, shew both how unable and unwilling this poor man is to do Mr. F. right in several other particulars; and also answer those arguments whereby he opposeth his main Doctrines.

After he had begun his Pamphlet with a most obligingly civil Address to his beloved Mr. F. (which shall be seen anon) he next falls foul upon his Descriptions of Holiness, and not to take notice of the failure of sense in his Setting down the Second and Third, as not deserving the name of faults in this man, he claps in between the Third and Last, one of his own devising. *You farther (saith he) call it a Principle or habit of Soul originally dictates of humane nature.* Profound sense believe it! But to pass this by too, he cites p. 8. for it. But what is there said is only this, *that the Divine Moral laws are either those that were first written in mens hearts, and originally dictates of humane nature, or necessary conclusions and deductions from them.* So that Holiness and the Moral laws are with him the same. This I will not also charge J. B's dishonesty, but on his woful ignorance. You see he is so used to talk and scribble non-sense, that he cannot easily write sense when prepared to his hand, and therefore we may guess how well he *understands* it. Is not this a right goodly Tool to make a Preacher of? *But who so bold as blind Bayard.* Next observe that

1. From Mr. F's Descriptions of Holiness by an *Healthful Complexion of Soul*, and the *Purity of the humane nature*, he would make us believe he hath asserted that mens natures since the fall (as I have already intimated) continue sound and whole; and thereupon cries out *that no man by nature hath any soundness in him*, and sets himself to prove the corruption of nature, and a mighty bawling he makes about this.

But

But doth not Mr. F. affirm, that men by their Apostasy from God, and sinking into Brutish sensuality, have sadly dispossessed themselves of this most excellent temper, and are become like the beasts that perish? This he doth presently after his Descriptions of Holiness. Nay does he not suppose that this soundness and Purity is lost, in making it the design of his Book to demonstrate that it was Christ's grand business to restore it?

He saith, that this Purity and Healthful Complexion are things a great way off from the Spirit of grace and the gracious workings of the Spirit, A fine chime! But doth not Mr. F. in the very first Page say, that the holiness he so describes is a complication of all the virtues? whereby he understands what the Gospel doth by virtues, viz. the graces of Gods holy Spirit. And doth he not say in his Descriptions of Holiness, that 'tis such a temper of the inward man, as causeth men to be actuated by all those good principles that are made known by Revelation; that is, to obey all the Laws of God, and are not all the graces of the Spirit virtually contained in such a temper as causeth men so to do?

He saith, it must be concluded that the Divine Nature Mr. F. talks of, is no other than the dictates of humane nature. If this Fellow were now at my Elbow, I would know of him what the word Dictates means, 'tis plain that a Goose understands that Phrase as well as he; and therefore he infers that non-sense from Mr. F's Descriptions. But who sees not that that which is to be concluded from them in this good sense, viz. That a Divine Nature doth enable him that is induced with it, according to the measure he hath of it, to obey not only the dictates of Nature, but also whatsoever laws are made known by Divine Revelation. J. B. could not but know this, if he ever considered those descriptions, and if he did not, what a sad Creature is he to undertake (I won't say to confute) but to inveigh against them.

After

4. After he had spent almost another Page again in crying out of the Corruption of nature, and bringing Scripture to prove it, as if Mr. F. had most plainly denied what he as plainly asserts as words can do it, he comes to these words in one of the descriptions [*keeps his supreme faculty, in it's throne*] &c. and saith, *that they suppose it is within the Power of a mans own soul always to keep Sin out of it self, &c.*

But can he think that these words suppose it, when 1. Mr. F. makes holiness the effect of God's grace and Spirit, not of a mans own power. 2. When he doth deny any such thing as perfect holiness in this life, p. 27. And 3. When he saith immediately after his Third description, that so far forth as holiness is *vigorous* and *predominant* in men, it causeth them to perform good actions, and forbear the contrary.

All this lamentable stuff is in the two first Pages. But I have something else to do than thus to trace him to the end, for 'tis all alike: and therefore I can look for no other, should I do so, from all wise men, than to be call'd fool for my pains. I will therefore only take notice of those things that he builds most noise upon.

After a deal of hideous nonsense, and running over the same things again and again, he saith in p. 13.

5. That this Righteousness, as Mr. F. hath described it, is not that which justifieth us before God.

1. *Because it is our own*, and tells us, *that there is the righteousness of men, and the righteousness of God.* But is that Righteousness our *own* that is wrought in us by God's Holy Spirit? Is not that God's righteousness which is the effect of God's grace? who sees not that it is? And therefore his Citation of *Phil. 3. 9.* will do him no service; for *S. Paul* meant no other *there*, by his *own* Righteousness which is of the Law, than that which consisted in the observance of the purely Jewish Law; which he calls his *own* righteousness because he could obtain it by his own natural power, it consisting

sisting of external performances. And by the Righteousness of God by Faith in the next verse, he means the righteousness of the new Creature wrought in him by God's Holy Spirit; through Faith in Christ's Gospel: And so the Apostle explains himself in the following words: *That I may know him and the Power of his Resurrection, &c.* — That is, that I may know the power of his Resurrection in raising me up to newness of life, and of his death, in mortifying all my lusts.

And whereas he abuseth *Rom. 10. 3.* to the same purpose, take notice that *their own Righteousness* there, is no other than that the unchristian *Jews* gloried in, as that by which alone they expected justification and eternal Salvation; and 'tis the same with that in the *Philippians*.

He saith, *The Righteousness Mr. F. hath described is the Righteousness of the Moral Law only.*

2.

But I say, that his general Descriptions take in the Righteousness of the *Gospel* too. 'Tis said that 'tis such a disposition and temper of the inward man, as causeth men to be under the power of all practical principles made known by Revelation; and all the Laws of the Gospel, I hope, are such. And Mr. F. abundantly sheweth, that this Righteousness is by the Faith of Jesus Christ, (that is, by effectually believing Christ's Gospel) in shewing what an admirable instrument the Gospel is to work this Righteousness. And this is an answer to the text quoted out of *Rom. 3. 21.*

Mark, by the way, *¶ B.* takes *Faith* still for nothing else but a bare relying on the merits or righteousness of Christ, which any presumptuous wretch may do; but I will make it good against men of an hundred times his abilities (if it be possible any such should be of his mind) that the true Christian Faith is such a Belief of the doctrine of the Gospel, as implieth an hearty compliance with all its Precepts; whereof that of relying on Christ's merits is one, and but one.

He saith, *the Righteousness Mr. F. hath described can't justify before God because of its imperfections*: and then follows another

3.

Page,

page, within two or three lines, spent in proving and Crying out of the corruption of nature; in the midst of which he brings *Gal. 2. 16.* to prove *that* his assertion; where he said 'tis, *By the works of the Law shall no flesh living be justified.* But I have told the Reader already that Mr. F. never affirmed, but absolutely denyeth justification by any thing but the Righteousness of Christ *only* as a *meritorious* cause; and he holds the true living Faith to justify as a *Condition*, without which no man by the Righteousness of Christ shall be justified. And whereas the Apostle saith, by the works of the law none shall be justified, his meaning is that none shall be justified by the *merit* of them, nor yet in any sence by them considered as opposed to the obedience of the Gospel.

4. He saith, *the Righteousness which Mr. F. hath described can't justify because 'tis not of faith.* This he proves from *Gal. 3. 12.* *The Law is not of Faith.*

The meaning of that place is, the law makes no account of Faith, allows no justification but on condition of legal obedience; as the following words shew, *but he that doth them shall live in them.* But now the Righteousness Mr. F. hath described *doth* make account of faith, it causing men to comply with *all* Divine Revelations, and therefore with the Gospel.

6. He saith p. 18. that *there are three things essential to Gospel Holiness, of which Mr. F's Descriptions are utterly destitute. The Holy Ghost: Faith in Christ: A new heart.*

1. *The Holy Ghost.* But Mr. F. hath shewn that this Righteousness cannot be obtained without the assistance of the Holy Ghost. But 'tis false and nonsense to say the Holy Ghost is of the *Essence* of Righteousness, and therefore that he ought to be put into the definition of it: He may as well say, that a man is falsely described, when he is said to be a *Reasonable Creature indued with a Soul and Body*, because God his Creator is left out of the description.

As for *Faith in Christ*; I have again and again shewed that it is manifestly contained in Mr. F's descriptions.

And then for *a new heart and a new spirit*, What difference is there between *these* and *Purity of nature*, and a *Sound complexion of Soul*, and a *Divine or Godlike nature*? doth not every body know that these are but several expressions of the very same thing?

P. 23 He inveighs against Mr. F's saying, that it was *Christ's main errand to effect our deliverance out of that sinful state we had brought our selves into*, and so to put us again into possession of the holiness that we had lost. By this you see he was not ignorant, that Mr. F. asserted the corruption of nature, for all his base suggestions to the contrary.

Now saith he, *I would have the Reader take notice that in this last clause [to put us again into possession of that holiness which we had lost] is the Summ of all his large Descriptions, and the Holiness he contends for is only that which was in Adam before the fall.*

I answer that it is the same, the very same for kind; but in what degree Adam was holy is unknown to us.

This is, at least, without dispute that he was perfectly innocent, and was also indued with a Principle of Holiness and such powers, as whereby he could improve that principle to as great a height as humane nature was capable of. True holiness or inward real Righteousness was ever one and the same in its own nature; it was never nor ever can be any other than such a temper of soul as causeth an affectionate and hearty compliance with all goodness, and an abhorrence and detestation of all wickedness; which is the Sum of all Mr. F's descriptions of it. In short, it is the image of the infinitely holy God in man, and what God's Holiness is we may learn from such scriptures as these; *The Righteous Lord loveth Righteousness, &c. He is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity. The Lord is just in all his waies. The wicked and him that loveth violence his soul hates. The Lord is merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in Goodness and truth. God cannot lye, &c.*

Now this Holiness is in God *Originally*, he is an inexhaustible fountain of Goodness, nay he is *holiness itself, holiness*, as 'tis in him, is his very nature and essence; But in all creatures, whether *Angels or Men*, it is by way of *derivation* from him. Now observe, the Holiness that was in Adam was the image of God; *God made him after his own image*; and take notice again, that the Holiness of the Gospel is of the same nature is shewed by St. *Paul*. *Eph. 4. 24. He there Exhorting Christians to holiness, expresseth himself thus: And that ye put on the new man which after God (or after the image of God, or like to God) is Created in Righteousness and true holiness.* And again he plainly intimates and more than intimates too, that the Holiness of the Gospel is the same with that mankind hath *lost*, in the verse immediately foregoing, *And be renewed in the Spirit of your minds.* What is it to be *renewed* but to recover our former state or that which was *lost*? Lastly, Holiness is described by Mr. *F.* by a Divine and Godlike nature, and so the Apostle *Peter* calls the Gospel Holiness, *2 Pet. 1. 4.* Now what is the difference between a *divine or Godlike nature*, and the *image of God*? but I say once more God made Adam after his own Image, *Gen.*

* Observe that he challengeth Mr. *F.* to produce but one piece of a text, that in the least looks towards a proof, that christ came to restore the holiness we had lost; p. 36. and I think I have answered his challenge.

1. 27. What is clearer than all this? Not the Sun at noon.

* But let us now see the goodly Argument whereby this *Ignoramus* endeavours to overthrow this Doctrine.

1. Saith he, *Adam before the fall even in his best and most sinless estate was but a pure natural man*, which he explains thus, *consisting of body and soul, and in this mans heart God did also write the law, that is (saith he) the first principles of morals.* But doth not every man since the fall consist of body and soul? and does not the law still continue written in the hearts of men? Doth not the Apostle say concerning the very heathens *Rom. 1. That they having not the law are a law to themselves, and that they shew the work of the Law written in their Hearts,* &c? Was Adam no more than this comes to? Yes he adds too (for I will do him no wrong as wickedly injurious as he

is

is to Mr. F.) that *Adam was made of God sinless*. But are not all Brutes sinless too? So that according to this Doctrine, we now differ from *Adam* before the fall in nothing but what every *beast* it self hath. But let this man know, that God did not only write the law in *Adams* heart, but also indued him with a principle whereby he was enabled to yield perfect *obedience* to that law, and *this* by his fall he lost. Next see what folly he discovers in proving this gross assertion concerning *Adam*, he doth it by that of the Apostle 1 Cor. 15. 45. and thus he sets it down, *The first Adam was made a living Soul, howbeit that was not first which was spiritual, but that which was natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth earthy. Observe 1. He saith, that here Adam is said to be but a natural man, even in his first and best estate earthy when compared to Christ; or with them that believe in Christ. So that he makes Christ and them that believe in Christ the same, for Adam is here only compared with Christ. 2. that which the Apostle speaks only concerning Adams body, this I. B. understands concerning his soul. This I never heard of any one that once doubted, and no one can that understands sense, if he reads that Chapter, or but the context of those words. The Apostle makes it his business in that 15th to the Corinth. to prove the doctrine of the Resurrection; and from verse 35. shews what bodies Christians shall rise with; and having said that the body is sown in corruption and raised in incorruption, sown in dishonour raised in glory, sown in weakness raised in power, he adds v. 44 it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body: there is a natural body, (that is an animal body, for so the word in the Greek signifies, that is, a body that needs meat and drink,) and there is a spiritual body, or a pure fine immortal body that needs neither. Now follows that which I. B. hath cited, And so it is written, the first Adam was made a living Soul, the last Adam was made a quickning Spirit (which words he hath left out) howbeit that was not first which is not spiritual, but that which is natural, and after that which is spiritual, (that is the animal body was first, and afterwards*

'tis to be changed into a Spiritual body) *the first man is of the Earth Earthy, &c.* that is the first mans *body* was so, for his *Soul* (as the history of his creation tells us) was not from the earth. And whereas *Adam* is said to be made a *Living Soul*, the word **שׁוּל** *Soul* is by a Metonymy very often used to signifie the *body*, and that not only *living* but *dead* too; nay, the *breath*, and the *bloud* also ; of these significations of it I can give abundance of instances out of the Holy Scriptures, but 'tis so well known, that I will not lose one moment upon it. And whereas the *Second Adam* is called in opposition to the *First* a *quickning Spirit*, that is, he is a quickner of dead bodies. But now, what is all this to *J. B's* purpose ? he might as well have quoted for it ; *in the beginning God created the Heavens and the Earth.* And in interpreting those words as he hath done, he hath put as great an Abuse upon the *Apostle* as he hath done, upon *himself*, that is, made him a most wretched arguer. You see again, what a sad *Soul* this is to take upon him to be a publick Teacher, he that so abuseth the most plain Scriptures in Print, (as I can shew he doth in a vast multitude of instances besides this) what woful work may we conclude he makes with them in his ridiculous *Preachments*.

2. He saith, *that Adam in his best and most sinless estate was a Type and Figure, a Type and Figure doubtless in his sinless and holy estate, a Type or Figure of the Holiness of Christ.* This must be taken upon his own word, he saith *doubtless* 'tis so, but gives not one word of proof. But suppose it were so, it would be nothing to his purpose ; would this prove that *Adams* holiness was of a different kind from the Holiness of Christians, or of Christ either ? but I say *doubtless* it is not so ; we only read that he was in his *fallen* estate a figure : And that is in *Rom. 5. 14.* By *Figure* there is meant the opposite member in a comparison, and there the Reader may see how *Adam* and *Christ* are compared.

He saith, *the holiness that was in Adam and we lost in him, was such as stood in, and was managed by his natural perfect compliance with a covenant of works.* On the other side of the leaf, he would acknowledge no more than that *Adam* had the law written in his heart, now we see he grants that he perfectly complied with that law; how thick is his ignorance that knows not the difference between these two! But what again is this to the purpose? Why, 1. saith he, *Adams holiness was a natural perfect compliance, &c.* But prithe 7. B. is it ever the worse for being *natural*, is not the holiness of the good Angels, *natural* to them? nay, is not the Holiness of God *natural* to him? or is it therefore of a different kind from the holiness of Christians, because *theirs* is not *natural*? I should affront my Reader, should I go about to prove to him, that the *different manner* of receiving these two doth not make them to be of a *different nature*: Because *Adam* was created with his Holiness, and the holiness of the Gospel is by *regeneration* or a *new-birth*, are they not therefore of the same kind? 2. He saith, that *the Covenant Christ brings in is a better Covenant than Adams, a blessed Covenant of grace, and he possesseth his children with the holiness and priviledges of that Covenant.* But I say, the holiness that Christs Covenant of grace requires, is of the same nature with that required in the Covenant of works, but the difference is, the condition of the former is *true* holiness, and that of the latter is *perfect* holiness: by virtue of the *former* sincerity is accepted, and by virtue of the latter nothing short of perfection; and so the holiness of the one and the other differ only in degrees; and the holiness required by the Covenant of works is so far from being *meaner*, that 'tis as much *above* that which the Covenant of grace accepts, as *perfection* is above *sincerity*.

He saith, *the holiness that was in Adam, and that we lost by the fall, was such as might stand with perfect ignorance of the mediation of Christ; for Christ was not made known to Adam as a Saviour before he was a Sinner.*

What

Dirt wip't off,

What stuff is here again? Doth this make the one and the other holiness to be of a different nature? And was *Adams* Holiness ever the worse because it stood with perfect ignorance of Christ's mediation? Nay, it was therefore far *better* than we can attain to in *this* life because he *needed* no mediator.

5. He saith, *the Holiness that was in Adam was never given him through the promise, nor encouraged by the promise. Adam had no promise to possess him with a principle of holiness; it came to him by Creation; neither had he any promise to strengthen or encourage him in Holiness.*

But 1. How doth he know he was not encouraged by a Promise? if God did make him a promise was he bound to tell us so? 2. There was a promise that if he did not eat of the tree he should live, implied in the threatening, that if he did eat he should die. 3. But suppose this to be true, what is it to the purpose? and what doth it make for him to say that *Adam's* holiness was not given him through the Promise, but by Creation, when (as was said) a different manner of obtaining a thing makes no change in the nature of the thing it self.

Lastly, He sums up all this sottish prate together, and thereby expresseth his brutish contempt of the Holiness we have lost. *In a word (saith he) it was a natural, shadowish, old Covenant, promiseless Holiness such as stood and might be walked in while he stood perfectly ignorant of the Mediator Christ. You see Reader, what a vile object of contempt he makes himself.*

7. He next (p. 26.) quarrels with that Saying before the Descriptions of holiness, namely, *that the holiness that's the design of Christianity is not subjected in any thing without us, nor is made ours by a mere external or outward application. To this he saith,*

That

That these words secretly smite at the justification that comes by the imputation of the glorious Righteousness, that alone resideth in the person of the Lord Jesus, and that is made ours by an Act of Eternal Grace, we resting upon it by the faith of Christ.

Here's malice with a witness? Does not he know that Mr. F. hath asserted the imputation of Christ's Righteousness, and that the worst he saith is, that 'tis not the *ultimate* end of Christianity, but that 'tis designed in order to the promoting of inward holiness, as all Christian Priviledges are? And does he not therefore know, that when Mr. F. saith, that the Holiness that is *the* design of Christianity is such as he there affirms, that he means by *the* design the chief and main, or the design by way of eminence? He that hath read but the *Title* page cannot but see this; for he interprets there *the* Design of Christianity by ultimate End and grand intendment. One may sufficiently understand the naughtiness of this mans Spirit by this one instance.

By the way, I must tell the Reader, that whereas Mr. F. doth somewhere in his Book call Holyness the *onely* design of Christianity, he must needs be most disingenuous that can interpret that [*onely*] so severely as to exclude all other ends, the whole business of the Treatise being to demonstrate it to be the ultimate or last end, *that is*, in reference to men; and no man can think that he would any where assert more than he designed to prove. And he could mean no more by *onely*, than as in common Speech it is very ordinarily used, that is, for *special* or *principal*. And so the Reverend and Learned Mr. Baxter hath expounded the word in defence of Mr. Fowler.

These are his words, where he and others do say, that *Holiness is the only design of the Promises, &c.* You must not interpret them too severely, nor suppose them to speak properly, or accurately; but [*onely*] is an hyperbolical expression, as many use the word [*infinite*] as an attribute of created things, &c.

This.

2.

This *J. B.* saith, *But if the Holiness Mr. F. speaks of be not subjected in any thing without us; then it is not of all that fulness which it pleased the Father should dwell in us: For the Holiness and Righteousness, even the inward Righteousness that is in the Saints; it is none other than that which dwelleth in the Person of the Son of God in heaven.*

Now, Reader, thou understandest what a *Ranting Antinomian* this man is, or rather (if he knows what he saith) a *down right Ranter*. For this most abominable assertion he brings *John 1. 16.* of his fulness we all receive and grace for grace. But would any one that hath the least of Sobriety have understood this Text otherwise than thus; viz. *Christ is a bountiful bestower of grace on his*, especially when 'tis not said, *we all receive his fulness*, but we receive of (or from) his fulness, as the Greek Preposition signifies.

Observe here that this monstrous piece of impudence saith, that the Saints on earth are as perfectly holy as Christ himself, in asserting that *their holiness and righteousness is none other than that which dwelleth in the Person of the Son of God in Heaven*. Now I will cry Blasphemy too, and that upon most just grounds. There is also another place he abuseth to favour this Blasphemy, viz. *1 John 2. 8.* but let the Reader see how that makes for him. I sedately, and without the least inclination to passion, profess; that I cannot remember I ever knew such a shameless abuser and perverter of the holy Scriptures in all my dapes.

But I wonder how he came here to escape that Text, *Eph. 1. 19.* *That you may be filled with the fulness of God; where, by fulness of God, we must understand that height of grace to which God designeth to raise Christians: as the Righteousness of God signifieth (as I shewed) the Righteousness that is the effect of Gods grace and Spirit: but according to this J. B's. wild rate of interpreting, the sense of the words would be that ye may be Goddified, or be made God himself; which is a blasphemy that any one but a very Devil would tremble*

tremble at the thoughts of. And I pray, Reader, how much short of *this* do those strange words of *J. B's.* come, which I find in p. 63. in heaven *there shall not be in us a likeness onely to, but the very nature of God*; that is, (if he understands that word) the *Essence* and very *Deity* of God.

And observe to thy amazement, that he proves this by *Rom. 8. 17. Heirs of God, and joynt Heirs with Christ.* As if to be an Heir of *God* is to be an inheritour of his *nature* or *Godhead*; when to be the Heir of a man, no fool will understand to be the Heir of his *nature*, but of *all* or *part* of his *estate* and *goods*. If he should think that those words of *S. Peter* make for this horrid assertion; namely, *that ye may be partakers of the Divine nature*, let him know that the *divine nature*, ought to be rendred a *divine* (that is, a *God-like*) *nature*; and our Translators meant no more; though (little thinking how wretches would abuse it) they put *the* for *a*.

I would not so far imitate this man in his most (not only *unchristian* but also) *inhumane* uncharitableness to *Mr. F.* as certainly to conclude him as bad as his last cited words make him; but if they don't necessarily speak him guilty of the highest *impiety*, they demonstrate him most wofully *ignorant*, and therefore judge how dangerous a thing it must needs be for such a one to be suffered to preach the Gospel.

If he should say, (for I would prevent all his pleas for such mad talk,) that Christians are said to be even in *this* life the Temple of God and of the Holy Ghost, &c. A mere Novice in Christianity can tell him, that the meaning of the Metaphor is, that they are by their *special favour* and *graces* in the Church and in particular Christians, not that the *Divine Nature* and *Essence* *it self* can be otherwise there than in *other places*: whose brain is so wild, as not to apprehend the absurdity and contradiction of such an assertion?

To say a word or two more to his frantick doctrine of the Holiness that is in the Saints; he possibly may think that *Eph. 1. 17.* is a friend to it; where 'tis said, *That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith*; But none but a *Bunyan* that reads the foregoing verse with it, can doubt that the Apostle's

meaning is any other than *this*, namely, *That Christ may dwell by his Spirit, or the graces and fruits of his Spirit in your hearts, by or through faith or an effectual believing the Gospel; not by his individual Righteousness imputed to them, or accounted theirs.*

But lastly to conclude this, let the Reader observe, that there is *this* poison also in those words concerning the Saints Holiness, namely, *that there are no holy dispositions wrought by the Spirit of God in them; for (as was said) these are his words, that even the inward Righteousness that is in the Saints, it is none other than that which dwelleth in the Person of the Son of God in Heaven.* So that whatever for his credits sake he acknowledgeth elsewhere, he professeth *here*, that the only *inward* Righteousness or holiness of the Saints is but Christ's *imputed* Righteousness; which is to say also, that they have no *inward* Holiness at all.

8. Then next, he puts as wicked a sense on the following words of Mr. F's. as he doth on the abovesaid Scriptures, namely *these [But is originally seated in the soul and Spirit;]* and makes Mr. F. to say in them, *that holiness hath its original from us*: when the plain meaning is, that holiness is first seated in the Soul it self, not in the *outward* man; and (as I have said) he doth as expressly as is possible assert, that God's holy *Spirit* is the *Seater* of it there; and that those that have it are beholden to *Christ* for it. I have shewed this over and over.

9. Again in the 27. page, he proceeds to his accusation of Mr. F. as affirming, *that coming to God by Christ is in itself and absolutely considered an indifferent thing.* This he saith follows from Mr. F's. saying, that positive precepts are so, in that he makes *this* a positive Precept. But Mr. F. never said positive *Precepts* are so, but the *things enjoined* by them. Now see how ignorantly he talks.

If (saith he) *it be but indifferent in it self, 'tis not of the substance of Christianity.* But he that is but one remove from a child can tell him, that this is an egregiously false consequence. To say that a thing is in it self and absolutely considered indifferent is, (as hath already been shewn) only to say, that 'tis so considered without respect to the command of God, but the command of God hath made *going to him by Christ* a duty of *absolute and indispensable* necessity, and such a grand fundamental and essential of the Gospel, as that there is none greater: So that 'tis damnable for any one to whom the Gospel is revealed to omit this duty.

1.

He saith, that *an indifferent thing in it self is next to nothing, and then the blood of Christ is of no value at all*, and afterwards, he thus taunts it; *How indifferent? as indifferent as the blood of a silly Sheep, &c.* But thou most unsufferable abusive and provoking man, take this answer once for all; whatsoever is commanded us by the great God, how indifferent soever it was before, ceaseth then to be indifferent, but is of as absolute necessity to be done by us, as 'tis not to incur the penalty of eternal damnation. And I tell you once again, that no man in his wits ever could think any other, than that going to God by Christ is made a duty by a *Positive Law of God only*; nor did I ever hear of any one that was so mad as to deny this; nay, you your self will not dare to say, that this duty is commanded by the Law of Nature or the Moral Law, nay, you more than once say it is not. Go now and confess that you are either most shamefully ignorant, (as not knowing the difference between a *moral* and *positive Law*) or else that you do most wittingly and designedly calumniate and defame your brother. All men of any understanding will tell you, that one of these is most true of you, when they read this, and therefore take your own choice. But he that reads this whole Pamphlet will not, cannot doubt (if he be not grossly prejudiced) that you are not less *malicious* than you are *ignorant*.

2.

10. After abundance of repetitions, vile railing, and the most foolish cavills that ever man read, which I will not trouble my self with, he comes, p. 60. to tell Mr. F. that his saying that 'tis an impossible thing that a wicked man should have Gods pardon, and that Christ's Righteousness should be imputed to an unrighteous man, proclaim him to be ignorant of Jesus Christ, and then he undertakes thus to confute him.

I. Saith he, *God doth not pardon painted Sinners, but such as are really so.* That is granted, but it is when they are sincerely, through his grace, willing and desirous to leave their Sins; and then they do not, in this life cease to be Sinners, but they cease to be such as are called *wicked* and *ungodly*, by which phrases is meant *Presumptuous Sinners*. Then he tells Mr. F. impertinently, *that Christ dyed for Sinners*, but he must say he dyed *so* for Sinners, *as* to give them a pardon while they live and delight in sin, and refuse to be reformed, or he saith nothing to the purpose. But where is *this* said? I declare, *no where*, but the contrary in abundance of places: Is it not said, *Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out*? Acts 3. 19. *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of Sins*, Acts 2. 38. *Him hath God exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour to give Repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of Sins*. Repentance first, and then forgiveness Acts 5. 31. *Let the wicked forsake his way, &c. and let him return to the Lord, and he will have mercy on him, and to our God for he will (or he then will) abundantly Pardon*, Isai. 55. 7. *Wash ye, make ye clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well, &c. and what follows? Come now and let us reason together, saith the Lord, though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow, &c.* Is. 1. 16. Acts 26. 18. — *I send thee to open their eyes and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of Sins, &c.* Have I wrested these Scriptures (to which I can add innumerable more,) and don't they as plainly

plainly speak turning from Sin to be a necessary condition of pardon, as words can do it? what blindness have they contracted that don't see this! But *J. B.* hath a Text for his turn, which all his brethren cry up mightily, namely, that in *Rom. 4. 5. God justifieth the ungodly.* But doth not every body see, that that text will contradict hundreds of other Scriptures, if it be otherwise to be understood than *thus*; *God justifies those that were once ungodly, not while they are ungodly*: God doth not, nay he cannot pass a false judgment, and declare those Righteous, that are utterly void of Righteousness: God's nature is so holy, that he no less abominates to be a justifier of the wicked, while they continue so, than to condemn the Righteous. He hath declared, *No peace to the wicked.*

Now take notice Reader, that there is no doctrine delivered in *M. F.*'s book, that he is so outrageously mad at, as at this doctrine. Now suppose it should be false (as 'tis as true as the Gospel) what danger can there be in asserting, that men by the free grace of God are delivered from the Power of Sin, before (that is in order of nature) he delivers them from the guilt of it. And who but the Devil, or one devoted to his Service, can curse that man with Bell Book and Candle that delivers this doctrine? Nay, who but a man that loves his lusts with all his heart, and cannot endure to think of parting with them, would not be ready to embrace this doctrine as soon as 'tis sufficiently proposed to him? And once more, who that hath any love for inward real Righteousness, would desire to be dealt with as if he were a perfectly Righteous man, merely because he hath so strong a fancy as to imagine Christ's Righteousness is imputed to him? And nothing but this fancy is the Faith of this *J. B.* He declares p. 17. (to omit other places) that Faith in the justification of a Sinner from the curse and wrath of God, respecteth only the mercy of God, and forgiveness of Sin for the sake of Christ. So that he that hath but confidence enough strongly to believe (though he hath no more reason to do than because he believes so) that his Sins are forgiven, hath justifying faith. Again (saith he) in the
next

next words, *God for Christs sake hath forgiven him that is unable to believe, that is, to trust to, and venture the Eternal concern of his Soul upon the Righteousness that is nowhere to be found, but in the person of the Son of God.* The destroyer of Souls cannot invent more destructive Doctrine. Nor is that to be heeded that they say, that Holiness will by way of *gratitude* be the consequent of such a faith; for 1. we know by experience that that is false; for we see that the most hardned wretches have ordinarily the strongest confidence, that the merits and Righteousness of Christ is theirs, which (as I said) is this poor mans faith. But 2. *this Salvo* (as a worthy person saith) is like to prove but a slippery hold, when 'tis believed (as those people do) that Gratitude it self as well as all other graces is in them already by imputation: They must say something to make their wretched doctrine to seem less odious, or they would scarcely be indured in a Christian State.

But whereas I said, that the fore-mentioned *Salvo* is demonstrated by experience to have nothing of Truth, I must tell the Reader, that I need go no farther for an example than this poor Creature himself; he is as sad an instance of the falsity of that pretence as ever I knew. No man discovers a stronger confidence (as I can prove) in the merits of Christ, nor more presumes that the Righteousness of Christ is imputed to him, than doth this man; but in the mean time, what is the holiness that this Faith of his hath produced? If as insolent pride as ever man heard of, the most outrageous Fury, the most turbulent Spirit, the most reviling and *defaming* Pen and Tongue, and consequently the most malicious Soul can consist with the mortification of Sin, and true holiness, then this man may be a *holy* man; but he that saith they *can*, affirms this horrid contradiction, *viz.* that the most thick Egyptian darkness may have fellowship with pure light, and the most exact and lively resemblances of the Devil, may consist with the image of the infinitely holy God, and a Divine nature.

Let him not think himself a *Saint* because he hath a *zeal*, and pretends to have it for God too; for so the worst of men the

the Pharisees had, and the Crucifiers of the Lord of Glory, *Rom. 10. 2.* or because he preacheth and makes *long* prayers, for besides that (if same belies him not) those are such, as *alone* declare him not only a very *absurd* but *naughty* man, I say besides *this*, the Abominable *Pharisees* were as good at those things as *he* for his *heart* can be. If he thinks that his despising and separating from others as carnal and prophane wretches, (though far better than himself) and such as communion with whom will defile him, is an argument of his holiness; I will only ask him who those were that cried *Stand by thy self, come not near to me, for I am holier than thou, Isai. 65. 5.* and who those likewise were that *S. Jude* saith *Separated themselves*, as being much more perfect than others, and calling themselves *the Spiritual. v. 19.*

If he flatter himself with a fond conceit (as no doubt he doth) that suffering persecution is a great evidence of holiness, the *Quakers*, which he himself counts most damnable Hereticks, have suffered as much, and many of them far more than ever he hath done, whose persecutions have been but fleabites or not so bad, nay no other than such as have contributed to his purse, far more plentifully than ever his cast of trade could. But besides the Apostle tells us, *If I give my body to be burnt and have not Charity, (which I. B. proclaims himself (if the Tree be known by the fruit) utterly void of) it profiteth me nothing*: Read the 13 Chap. of the first to the *Corinthians*, and you need not be told how charitable this man is. In a word, the Devil hath his Martyrs as well as Jesus Christ.

He will not say that being no *drunkard* or *fornicator*, &c is any argument of a holy man, for he inveighs against none as unholy so much, as those he is not able to tax with the vices that denominate men so, or any *other* immoralities; and I must tell him too; (however he take it) that *his* vices are as far beyond such, as are those that render men like to *Devils* more black and filthy, than those that make them resemble *Brutes*: And our Saviour hath told the men of *I. B's* Saint-

Saintship, that *Publicans* and *Harlots* shall enter into the Kingdome of Heaven before themselves.

I heartily again pray, that this plain and most honest dealing may be successful to his true Repentance; but it is scarcely to be hoped it will, so long as he persists in his gross conceits concerning that blessed doctrine of *justification by faith*, and *imputation of Christs Righteousness*, (which are but two expressions of one and the same thing, as is abundantly proved in the Free Discourse) for while he roals himself on Christ for Salvation, and strongly conceits that he is clad with his Righteousness, (which I have with undeniable evidence shewn to be the whole of his justifying faith) he looks upon all his sins, *past, present and to come*, as *actually* pardoned, and therefore who that is not as blind as a *post* cannot see, that Repentance is then a *needless* and *vain* thing; nay, and that 'tis but a meer mockery for such a one as *I. B.* so much as to *pray* for the pardon of his sins. And I entreat those that use to hear him, to observe whether ever he doth so. He contradicts himself egregiously, if he doth any more than pray that God would give them a sense and assurance that their sins are pardoned; the plain English of which petition is in him no more than this, that *God would strengthen* more and more their already too strong fancies, that they may not doubt, but that their foul pollutions are all hidden from his all-seeing eye by the garment of the Righteousness of Christ cast over them; and that they may be more and more assured, that (as bad as they are) Christs righteousness doth not suffer him to see any iniquity in them.

I Say 'tis scarcely to be hoped, that this man should ever *repent*, or so much as *pray for pardon*, till he comes to embrace that doctrine which he now so detests: *viz.* That receiving of Christ as a *Lord to rule*, as well as a *Priest to save*, is a condition without which God will pardon none for the sake of Christ; and also that no mens sins are actually pardoned before they are repented of, and therefore much less before they are committed, and that Christs *individual* Righteousness

teousness is not made any mans in a proper sense, much less that it is to merely because he believes it is so; and that there is no other doctrine true concerning the imputation of Christs Righteousness than this, *That those only that are enabled by the grace of God to hate and detest their sins, or are endued with inward real righteousness, shall have the benefit of Christs righteousness*: For to have Christs Righteousness imputed (as is fully proved in the aforesaid book) is onely (and that is as much as heart can wish) to have as great advantages by his righteousness, accruing to us, as if it were in the properest sense imaginable made ours.

Before I go farther, let me tell the Reader, that this whole Doctrine of Mr. F's concerning justification by Faith is most invincibly defended by Abundance of the Orthodox Divines of the Church of England, and by none more effectually than by Mr. Baxter in his *Book against Crandon* long since written, and in many other of his works. Which, if it be possible, thou shouldest yet be dissatisfied concerning it, thou wilt do well to peruse; and which if this I. B. had ever read, (or but anyone of them, and had the wit to understand it) he had never made himself so infamous as to publish to the world such filthy stuff; nor brought out the worst of those woful arguments for the defence of his doctrine, that have been answered a thousand and a thousand times.

In Page 66. and other places he makes woful work with Mr. F's saying, that *Christ trod every step before us of the way that leads to Gods Kingdom*; and cries therefore he went to heaven by vertue of an imputative Righteousness, and by vertue of his own intercession, and faith in his own blood, and then Christ must come to God, and ask mercy for some great wickedness that he hath committed.

II.

But here he also discovers a most ill nature and perverse spirit, for no man of any candour could otherwise have understood Mr. F. in those words than thus: That Christ was an example of all those virtues or graces that qualifie men for

H

the

the Kingdom of God: was he not an example of all those graces that together denominate a man pure in heart, can he dare to say he was not? Now doth not our Saviour say, *Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God*: But then, saith he, *what say you to going to heaven by vertue of an imputative Righteousness, and of his own intercession, and faith in his own blood*? I say all these are no other than going thither by Faith in Christ, that being faith in his blood, and Righteousness and intercession, but those that understand the Christian Religion will tell him, that the obtaining of this purity of heart, or the graces Christ was an example of, is the end of *this Faith*; So much the Apostle intimates in those words *purifying their hearts by faith*, and it is the business of *the Design of Christianity* to demonstrate this. So that 'tis most true, that whosoever follows Christs example shall see the Kingdome of God, but we cannot follow it without faith in his merits, faith in his power, or in one word, without effectual believing the Gospel, which takes in the whole of the Christian Faith.

And whereas he saith, that if this doctrine be true, *Christ must ask God mercy for some great wickedness committed by him*; how does that follow? Christ ask'd God mercy for us, and do not we do as he did, when we ask it for *our selves*? But then he monstrously foolishly proceeds, and saith, if this be so, then *we cannot come to heaven before we be accursed of God, we must first make our body and Soul an offering for the sin of others, then we must go to heaven for the sake of our own Righteousness*. And then he insultingly cries *O Sir! what will thy gallant generous mind do here*? This might be a Sad nonplus indeed, were Mr. F. a perfect Changling. But observe, did Mr. F. say that Christ trod no steps but those we must tread? is this saying, *that he trod before us every step which he hath told us leads to the Kingdom of God, (or that we must go in to the Kingdom of God) the same with this, that he trode no other but those we must tread*? Can any man be such a sot as not to discern the wide difference between these two propositions. By the way take notice, that it is blasphemy
to

to say, that Christ was accursed of God in any other sense than this, *that* he suffered such a kind of death as was by the law of *Moses* pronounced accursed. So the Apostle explains his being made a curse, *Gal. 3. 13.* Christ was alwayes Gods beloved Son, nor was he ever more a darling of heaven than when he hung upon the Cross. And that the Reader may be truly informed in the Doctrine of Christs Satisfaction, (false notions whereof make this *I. B.* talk most gross things) I entreat him to get and carefully peruse the Learned Dr. *Stillingsfleets* Treatise upon that Subject; there you will find that Christ did not suffer the very *same* punishment that is due to sinners, but that what he suffered for sinners sakes was as Satisfactory, and answered the ends of Government as much, as if all mankind had perished: And thanks be to God that Doctrine of Christs suffering the very same is now generally exploded.

But to return, observe but these Scriptures, and you will *then* need no more than what hath been said, to discern how ridiculously and wretchedly this *I. B.* talks in several places about the life of Christ.

Luke 9. 23. *If any man will come after me (or be a Christian) let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me.*

1 Pet. 2. Christ suffered for us leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps, who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth, who when he was reviled, reviled not again; &c.

1 John 2. 6. He that saith he abideth in him, ought himself also to walk, even as he walked.

V. 29. If ye know that he is Righteous, ye know that every one which doth righteousness, is born of him.

1 John 3. 7. Little Children, let no man deceive you, he that doth righteousness is righteous even as he is righteous.

1 John 4. 17. Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment, because as he is or was (the Analage of the tense being ordinary) so are we in this world.

Now this *I. B.* saith p. 106. *that our Saviours life in all duties that respected morals was not principally, or first, to be imitated by us, but that the Law, even in the preceptive part thereof, might be fully and perfectly fulfilled for us.* Mark, 1. he saith in all duties that respected morals, what nonsense is this? any body may see he does not know what [*Morals*] means. 2. *That our Saviours life in these duties was not principally to be imitated by us;* he dares not say *not at all to be imitated*, though any body may see that reads his book, he would be glad to say so with all his heart: But what Scripture doth he bring for this? none at all. So that if you will not take his word for it, he hath nothing to say to you. 3. But saith he, *that the Law even in the preceptive part may be fulfilled for us,* was Christs principal design in living as he did. What proof hath he for this? *Rom. 10. 5. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness,* the end, saith he, not only of the Ceremonial law, but of the 10 commandments too; but is he the end of both alike? then we are no more now obliged to the *one* than to the *other*. In short, the meaning of those words is this, that Christ by introducing his Gospel, hath put an end to the Mosaical dispensation, but how does this make for him? And whereas he keeps such a stir with Christs fulfilling the law for us, he *adds* to the Scripture, 'tis nowhere said he fulfilled it *for us*, much less in *his* sense; the *Man* Christ Jesus (or Christ as *man*) was in the same subjection to the law that we are, and he would have been a sinner like unto us if he had *disobeyed* it, and the benefit we get by his perfect obedience is this, that it qualified him to be a satisfactory Sacrifice for our sins, which without it he could not be; but Christ never obeyed the law *for us* so as that, *his* obedience should be looked on as *ours*; for then what necessity can there be of our own *personal* obedience.

You see, Reader, what a Sweeper down of Cobwebs I am grown! the truth is, all this mans cavils have nothing so much substance in them as a *Cobweb* hath; they are rather to be likened

likened to the Apples of *Sodom*, do but touch them and they fall to dust, nay, to a perfect nothing. But I will thus idly employ my self but a very little while longer.

He quarrels with Mr. *F.* p. 85, 86. for saying, that it is not needful to give a just Table of the primary fundamentals of the Gospel, and for keeping hid the secondary fundamentals. But 1. For his saying, that 'tis not needful to have a just Table of the former; he gives this reason, because 'tis impossible that a man that endeavours heartily to understand the Scriptures, in order to the bettering of his Soul by them, should erre in them, all fundamentals being as clearly revealed as heart can with. And 2. For his not particularizing the secondary fundamentals, I think this is a satisfactory reason; namely, that should he so do, he must transcribe all that is with indisputable clearness delivered throughout the Gospel.

12.

Then he saith, that *coming to God by Christ* is accounted by Mr. *F.* but one of the *secondarily* fundamental points. But that is wickedly false: He proves it thus, *because it is in itself indifferent.* But what if it be so, that is, without respect to the command of God that hath made it a duty, does it follow therefore that 'tis not a *primary* fundamental of the Christian Faith? Such are said by Mr. *F.* to be primary fundamentals, as without the knowledge and belief of which it is impossible to acquire that inward real righteousness, which the Christian Religion aimeth at; now God hath made *going to him by Christ* such a doctrine, as without the knowledge and belief of which 'tis impossible for us to acquire that righteousness, and consequently hath altered the nature of it. God hath declared that he maketh us to be accepted in the beloved, and that he hath exalted him to be our Prince and Saviour, and therefore *going to him by Christ* must needs now become necessary in its own nature, and quite another thing than what it was before that declaration. But God hath not so ordered things as that it should be necessary in its own nature to believe, that Christ's mothers name was *Mary*; but 'tis necessary from an *external* cause not to deny it, that

is.

is, because 'tis so plainly revealed that no good man can disbelieve it; and this according to Mr. F's doctrine is a Secondary fundamental. And now I hope I have enabled *J. B.* to understand that, at which he cries Confusion! darkneſs! confusion! and if he will not acknowledge that the darkneſs and confusion, he so tragically exclaims at, is only in his own brains, I am ſure every intelligent Reader will.

13. There is something I have let paſs in his 29. page, that I'll take notice of, before I conclude, which is this, that whereas Mr. F. ſaith, *that Calvin, Peter Martyr, Musculus, Zanchy, and others did not question, but that God could have pardoned Sin, without any other ſatisfaction, than the Repentance of the Sinner,* he ſaith to it, *it matters nothing to me, I have neither made my Creed out of them, nor any other than the holy Scriptures.* What *John*! because you have not made your Creed out of them, do the judgment of so many men famous for Learning and Godlineſs ſignifie *nothing* with you? This is like a ſaying of your own, that is, of one composed of *pride and ignorance*; how came ſuch a piece of *nothing* as thou art to be ſo highly conceited of thine own judgment? He ſaith, he hath made his Creed out of the *Scriptures*, but who are beſt accompliſht for the underſtanding of *them*? the *Learned* or *Idiots*? that would have been in an utter incapacity of underſtanding one line of the Bible without the help of the *Learned*, and muſt now truſt *their* ſkill as to the right Tranſlation of every word of it; and cannot have the leaſt gueſs at the meaning of a difficult place but by *their* aſſiſtance. But let us ſee his arguments, whereby he endeavours to overthrow that Doctrine.

1. Saith he, *Chriſt was from all eternity appointed to be the Saviour.*

But were not all things that God hath effected as much decreed from all Eternity as this? He dares not ſay otherwiſe, as bold as he is; but by the ſame argument then, whatſoever God hath done he could not but do, and he is no free Agent.

His

His Second goodly Argument is founded upon a miserably mistaken notion of God's justice, and the doctrine of Satisfaction : which I have something else now to do than to explain to him, especially *since* this that he here quarrels with was delivered but by the bye, and signifies nothing to the design of Mr. F's book.

He makes another Argument of these Scriptures, *Matt. 6. 39. If it be possible let this Cup pass from me.* But no body saith it was possible, after God had decreed Christ should suffer, that he should not suffer : But that which is said is, that God was not necessitated to decree it, though for great and wise reasons he did : was God necessitated to make men? though he was wise in so doing, yet could he not have done otherwise?

His Second Scripture is *Heb. 9. 22. Without shedding of blood is no remission.* True, but the reason is because it was the free decree of God, that remission should not be obtained without it.

His Third is *Luke 24. 26. ought not Christ to have suffered?* But the foregoing verse saith why he ought, *viz.* because the holy Prophets had foretold it.

The Last is *Acts 17. 3. Christ must needs have suffered.* But I say, 'twas the *voluntary* not *necessitated* decree of God, that made his suffering necessary. And the verse before *this* also shews the same.

These are the old Thread-bare Arguments he useth ; and I condescend to say what I have done to them, only to shew this *J. B's.* followers in another instance, what a judicious Creature they have chosen for their Teacher.

There is yet another thing in p. 70. that I'll bestow two or three lines upon. He there tells Mr. F. *that he will have a little touch upon his Principle of Freedom, which (saith he) you in p. 9. call an Understanding and Liberty of Will.* Observe his non-sense again. But what is it Mr. F. there saith that offends this man? 'Tis *this*, that he supposeth men indued with

with Understanding and Liberty of Will. Now proceeds he, *there is no such thing in man by nature as liberty of will, or a principle of freedom, in the saving things of the Kingdom of Christ.* But 1. Mr. F. saith never a word of liberty of will as to those things, but only supposeth this in general, *that man is indued with liberty of will*: And this he himself supposeth in denying it only as to the *Saving things of Christ's Kingdom.* 2. He limits that too, and saith *there is no such thing in man by nature as to those things*; will he therefore acknowledge there is such a thing in man by *grace*? If he will not, that limitation is ridiculous; but if he will, he is never like to have Mr. F. for his Adversary, in *this point*, nor any of *his judgment*. He hath declared in the book several times cited, p. 239. that the men of his judgment hold no *free will* that is opposite to *free grace*, and acknowledgeth in the next page the necessity not only of *assisting* but also of *preventing* grace.

And now let the Reader judg, whether Mr. F. hath written the least *tittle* contrary to any one of the 39 Articles of the Church of *England*, and particularly to those there concerning *Free-will*, *Justification*, and *Works before Faith*, which in general terms he hath charg'd him with, without shewing wherein he hath done it; though I acknowledg, if he hath not abused Mr. F's Book, that his accusation is no slander. But he is to his perpetual infamy most sensibly demonstrated to have bewrayed most woful ignorance, and notorious dishonesty, and ill nature, besides the foulest erroriouness, in what he hath published against *The Design of Christianity*.

But 'tis pleasant to observe, that this wretch, who abominates any thing (if one may judg by his rude behaviour) that bareth the name of the Church of *England*, should cite three of her Articles as main Orthodoxy's, in order to the more effectual defaming of Mr. Fowler. This is just like the Devils making use of Scripture to assist him in his malicious designs against our Saviour.

Lastly,

Lastly, He falls to compare Mr. F's Doctrine with *Campion's* the Jesuite, and *Pen's* the Quaker, and makes a parallel between several of his Sayings with Seven of the former, and Eight of the latter.

By the way take notice, that this lamentable piece of work is the labour of more clumsy Brains than this poor *J. B's*. For First, How should he come by Sayings out of *Campion*? but Secondly, (which is more considerable) he hath a company of Terms and Phrases, that he was never in a capacity of understanding, as *Commixed, Radicals, Abstract, Replication, &c.* derived from the *Latin*. Again *Characteristical, Diametrical, Parenthesis, Paragraph, &c.* borrowed from the *Greek* Language. And he is up with his *arguing from a thing to a thing, habit and act*, which smell of one whose name hath had the honour to stand a little while in a Colledge Buttery Book, and that had the luck sometimes to hear his Masters chopping Loggick together: For I'll warrant him, who ever was *J. B's*, fellow-labourer in this worthy performance, is a fellow that never was under a much higher dispensation. And 'tis he I presume that hath helpt our Author to his *after-conclusions*, p. 9. as if there were *fore-conclusions*.

Thirdly, The whole is a motly thing piec't and patch't together, as if it were the product of not so few as *two*, but a *Club* of Wise-akers. But yet all that understand *J. B's* manners, ability and temper, will accuse me as injurious, should I rob him of the honour of the down-right non-sense, knavery, Calumnies and vile language, which make a very *great*, if not the far *greater* part of the Pamphlet.

But to our business, *that is*, to the parallel between Mr. F's doctrine and a few Sayings of the *Papist* and *Quaker* set down by him, to which I reply in a few words.

I know not, whether this *J. B.* hath not as falsly represented these mens Sayings, as it hath been proved he hath done
I many

many of Mr. *F*'s. I have neither of the Books to examine the matter, nor have I ever read either, and therefore I cannot accuse him; but he hath been proved so very notoriously dishonest in this particular, that he ought never more to be trusted upon his *own* word.

2. But suppose he hath not too favourably represented any of them, the Reader will see if he compares them with the Sayings of Mr. *F*. set under them, that he abuseth most of *these* in making a parallel between them; as I would particularly shew, but that it will take up too much time, and any man of understanding that hath his book will immediately perceive that I charge him truly.

3. But Mr. *F*. I am sure will not stick to acknowledge, that there may be put upon most of them such a sense, as may speak them good and true sayings. As where *Campian* saith, that Faith justifies, but not faith *only*; this is no other than what S. *James* affirms in express words, *chap. 2. 24.* And Mr. *F*'s doctrine is, that faith, if it be taken for a mere relyance on Christ's Righteousness (which is but *one* act of faith) doth not *only* justify; but if it be understood *so* as to include the receiving of Christ according to *all* his offices, or for an *obediential* faith, so it doth *only* justify. That is, (as hath been shewn again and again) not as a *meritorious* cause but as a *condition*. He abhors to assert with the *Papists* the *merit* of works; nor doth he affirm that works are a necessary *condition* of justification, but as they are virtually in faith, for he every where makes a true and sincere *willingness* to obey Christ's precepts, which is implied in Faith, the necessary condition of justification.

4. There is not an Heretick in the world, but hath some good Sayings, this *J. B.* himself (as grossly erroneous as he is) is not *out* in every thing. And no wise man will love truth one jot the worse for hearing it from the Devils mouth. And I freely declare, that if the *Papists* and *Quakers* did assert no worse things than those *J. B.* hath cited, and without understood them as he by his parallel makes them to do, I would

would as heartily defend the principles of both, as I now oppose them.

Every body knows, that understands these men, that this *J. B.* and his Brethren joyn hands both with *Quakers* and *Papists*, in not a few Opinions and Practices as they are enemies to the Church of *England*, but doth he think himself and them one jot the more hereticks upon that account?

Thus the Reader sees how idle and malicious (that is, like all the rest) this his *last* charge also against *Mr. F.* is.

Before I come to the conclusion of all, I must advertise the Reader, that whereas *Mr. F.* p. 300. hath these words: *Let us declare, that we are not barely relyers on Christ's Righteousness by being imitators of it: J. B.* hath p. 111. for *barely* put *heartly*, and so makes *Mr. F.* to give this most wicked advice: *Let us declare that we are not hearty relyers on Christ's righteousness.* I examined his *errata* to find whether it were not a mistake of the Printer (though 'tis not easily to be thought it should, there being no resemblance between the words *barely* and *heartly*) but there is no such thing. And to confirm the suspicion that 'twas done designedly, he makes this to bring up the rear in his Catalogue of *Mr. F.*'s. 40. Doctrines destructive of Christianity, but here thus words it. *To be imitators of Christ's Righteousness, even of the Righteousness we should rely on, is counted by Mr. F. more noble, than to rely thereon, or trust thereto,* pag. 300.

Now mark, if he intended honestly, he would have said thus, viz. *Mr. F.* saith, *Let us declare that we are not barely relyers on Christ's Righteousness by being imitators of it:* For those and no other are *Mr. F.*'s. words he refers to; but he knew that none but the most paltry hypocrites could take any offence at that saying. Or, if he must be giving it in those other words of his own; he might have added the word *barely*, and then the saying would have been without all exception, viz. thus *To be imitators of Christ's Righteousness is accounted by Mr. F. more noble than barely to rely on it.* I am confident the Reader will say, that he never knew any one so impudent,

as thus effectually to prove himself in print, a man of a prostituted and debauched conscience. And my observing of this hath occasioned my taking notice of the foregoing Doctrine, viz. *this, To do well is better than believing*, p. 299. But Mr. F's. words are only these, *Let us exercise our selves—in studying the Gospel to enable us not to discourse, or only to believe, but also and above all things to do well.*

Now that doctrine of his cannot be so much as gathered from these words, all that follows from them is *this*, that any honest man will say as well as Mr. F. namely, that to do well is better than believing *without* doing well; for *well-doing* supposeth *believing*. The Reader can no longer wonder at his flying in Mr. F's. face so often with worse than *brutish* rage and fury, for asserting that Christ's Righteousness cannot be imputed to a wicked man while he continues so; his Conscience could not but tell him, that this touched *his* Copy-hold; and that if that doctrine be true, his case is sad. I will, now I am gotten to the Catalogue again, take notice of one of the Doctrines more that he chargeth on Mr. F. viz. the 37. namely: *There is no duty more affectionately commanded in the Gospel, than that of Alms-giving*, p. 284. I don't remember he saith any thing of this in the Book, but only sets it down here, as that the Reader would presently perceive is a doctrine destructive of Christianity. Mark, I say, I don't remember he doth, I do not positively affirm he doth not. But 1. Mr. F. doth not say that no duty is more affectionately commanded, but recommended; and who knows not that these two are not the same? 2. Now judg, Reader, whether any duty can be more affectionately recommended when 'tis said, that *pure Religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the Fatherless and widows in their afflictions, &c.* James 1. 27. Again S. John asks how the love of God can dwell in that man that refuseth to perform this duty, 1 John 3. 17. And James ch. 2. 14, 15, &c. Sheweth that the Faith, that is void of this particular good work, is a *dead* Faith; that is, no Faith at all. And our Saviour saith, *Matt. 5. 7. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy*: That is, those that are merciful

merciful from a good principle. And lastly, our Saviour instanth in no other works but *these*, that men shall be judged according to, at the great day, *Mat. 25. 34.* to the end. Can a duty be more affectionately and effectually recommended than this of *Alms-giving* is in these places? To which may be added many more. What can hard-hearted hypocrites say to these places? The only fence they have against them is their paltry explication of the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's Righteousness; by which also they can make all the *Precepts* of the Gospel to signifie nothing.

Again in the same *page, viz. III.* he tells Mr. F. that he hath applauded the *Godliness* of heathen Philosophers, when as he hath no where done so, and but only cited several of their excellent Sayings, and that too for the service of the Christian Religion. But this is no more than S. Paul himself doth, *Acts 17. 28.* and *Titus 1. 12.* But if Mr. F. had said, that very many of the *Heathens* were much better qualified for the Kingdom of Heaven than this *J. B.* hath demonstrated himself to be, I make no doubt but he had spoken truly, and not at all transgressed the Law of Charity; for there were multitudes of *Heathens*, that would have abominated such practices, as have with the most undeniable evidence been proved against this *pretended Christian*.

I can give several more instances of this mans unchristian dealing with Mr. F's. Sayings, and I doubt not but many have escaped my notice, for I have not *narrowly* lookt for any, but let the Reader, when he finds any thing cited by him out of Mr. F's. Book, that looks strangely; consult the book *itself*, and I dare promise him he shall find, that by either *altering* the Sentence, or *omitting* part of it, or *basely wresting* the words to another sense than the Context will bear, *J. B.* hath abused Mr. F. in it.

And now who that hath read this *J. B's* book will not tell me, that it is much more than high time I should have done with it; and that I have done *abundantly* more than enough to convince the Reader of the apparent folly and wickedness of it? Indeed I might well have concluded as soon as I had answered his miserably

rably simple objections against that doctrine, *that Christ came to restore the holiness we had lost*; for he saith, p. 42. *If you can prove that any of these promises were made to the Holiness we had lost, or that by these promises (viz. those of the Holy Spirit, remission of Sin, and eternal happiness in the enjoyment of God) we are to be possessed with that holiness again, I will even now lay down the Bucklers.* And again, when he had done his utmost to confute that doctrine, he brags *that he had raised the foundation of Mr. F's book*; so that the bare shewing how wofully he hath performed that *one* undertaking, would have been a sufficient confirmation and defence of it. But (though I have not found so much as *one* thing in it, that deserves to have a serious reply made to it) I have so far denied my self, as not only to lay enough to *undermine*, but also to give an *utter overthrow* to the whole of it: And to shew, that so far as it opposeth *The Design of Christianity*, 'tis composed of nothing else but the most horrid absurdities, belyings and revilings of that Treatise. Nay, it fully appeareth from what I have written, that never did any writing more flatly (that is in more evident consequences) oppose *the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ Jesus*, than this that he stileth a *defence of it*: And that were Mr. F. a *Julian, Celsus* or *Porphyry*, & an utter enemy to Christianity, as he wickedly accuseth him, he could never have wished to have a greater dishonor done unto it, than this man in his book hath done.

So that should I have considered every absurd and base passage from one end to the other of it, and given it its due remark, I should have made my self a most unmerciful drudg, and swelled these leaves to a large Volume, and been guilty of the most profuse and unaccountable expence of my time and Paper: For I sedately and consideratively profess, that I never read (that I remember) any thing that was half so full thrapt and crowded with both non-sensical and wicked stuff.

To conclude, if any Reader is now able to think, that there needs more than I have written (or *so much* either) to *wipe off the dirt* that is flung upon the Design of Christianity; I must be so free with him, as plainly to tell him, that he is honor'd far beyond his merits in having one wise word bestowed upon him.

A Catalogue of some few, of the abundance, of absurd and most wicked Doctrinals and Assertions, that are contained in John Bunyans Pamphlet, against the Design of Christianity.

1. **H**E calls *this* Paul's definition of a man: *There is none righteous no not one, there is none that understandeth,* &c. page 4.

Mark, as he most absurdly calls this *Paul's definition*, so he calls it too his definition of a *man*, not of a *wicked man*: And furably to this fine doctrine,

2. He makes no real distinction between the humane *Nature* and *Sin*. P. 3.

As if *Sin* were not the *corruption* of our nature, but *essential* to it.

3. He saith, that of *mans* *supreme faculty* the *Scripture* teacheth, that *man* in his best estate is altogether vanity, *Psal.* 39. 5. P. 5.

When as *David* speaks there only of *mans* *bodily frailty*. But I might have spared this, as being but a peccadillo in this man.

4. He saith, that the *Command* of the *Law* was not the great and principal argument with *Christ*, no not in its first and highest principles to do or continue to do it. P. 14.

Then the first reason of our Saviours obedience was not the *Command* of *God*.

5. He interprets those words of the *Apostle* of *moral duties*, viz. *They speak of the world, and the world heareth them*, 1 John 4. 5. P. 19.

6. He saith, that the *new man* is dead to the *Law* as to principles of nature, and interprets that of the *Apostle*, *you are become*

become dead to the law, of the moral as well as Ceremonial law; and further saith, that a man must first be dead to your principles both of nature and the law; If he will serve in a new spirit, if he would bring forth fruit unto God. P. 22.

The only sense of which sayings (whatever he meant by them) is this, that a man must cease to be a man and turn beast, nay and Devil too, before he can bring forth fruit unto God.

7. He interprets those words in 1 Cor. 15. 46. and after that which is Spiritual, of Spiritual holiness. P. 23
Whereas the words are only spoken of an immortal body.

8. He saith, that the holiness of Adam in his best estate, even that which he lost and we in him, it was no other than that which was natural, even the sinless state of a natural man. P. 24

Thus he makes Adam a mere Brute as to holiness, but in this he contradicts himself elsewhere, as hath been shewn.

9. He saith, that even the inward holiness that is in Saints; it is none other than that which dwelleth in the person of the Son of God in heaven. P. 27

Then there are no graces of the holy Spirit wrought in us, then our holiness is perfect and infinite, and then, according to his rate of arguing with Mr. F. p. 66. Christ's righteousness is by Faith in himself, and an imputative righteousness.

10. He saith, that Christ dyed to put us into a personal possession of pardon before we know it. P. 33

He that hath read his or this Pamphlet, knows his meaning in this saying, viz. that Christ dyed to put men into a personal possession of pardon, while they continue in their wickedness.

11. He saith, that for Christ to come to establish this righteousness (viz. the righteousness which we have lost) is all one, as if he should be sent from Heaven to overthrow and abrogate the Eternal purpose of Grace, which the father had purposed should

in Answer to a Lay-Preacher.

65

should be manifested to the world by Christ.

P. 37.

Let the Reader match me this Saying for the horrid wickedness of it, out of any other books than this mans, if he can,

12. The wrath that the Law is said to work, *Rom. 4. 15.* he interprets to be, *murmure and anger against the Lord.* P. 39

Whenas the next words shew that the meaning is, *it renders men for their disobedience to it lyable to the judgment of God.*

13. He saith, that that Repentance which bath its rise originally from the dictates of our own nature, is called the sorrow of the world, and must be again repented of.

P. 40.

So that to be sorry for my sins, because my reason tells me that they are an unworthy requital of Gods goodness to me, is the worldly Sorrow condemned by the Apostle, and must be again repented of.

14. He saith, that he that looks to or seeks after that holiness we have lost, is as sure to be damned and go to hell, as he that transgresseth the law, because that is not the righteousness of God, the righteousness of Christ, the righteousness of faith, nor that to which the promise is made.

P. 42.

So that according to this devilish doctrine, to endeavour to bring our hearts to the love of God above all, and to the hatred and abhorrence of all sin, is as ready or sure a way to hell, as living in disobedience to all Gods Commandments. And take notice that it is Proved, that that is the Righteousness of God, of Christ, and of Faith.

15. He saith, That it is a foolish, and an heathenish thing, nay worse, to think that the son of God should only or especially fulfil, or perfect the law and the prophets, by giving more and higher instances of moral duties than were before expressly given: This would have been but the lading of men with heavy burthens.

P. 46.

Observe

Observe that those words [*and the Prophets*] are of his own adding.

But whereas he saith, that our Saviours giving more and higher instances of moral duties, &c. *would be but the lading of men with heavy burthens*; he should have said, it would have been the lading of *Hypocrites*, such as *himself*, with heavy burthens, none but *such* can think them so.

16. *Christs Exposition* (he saith) *of the Law, was more to shew thee the perfection of his own obedience, than to drive thee back to the holiness thou hadst lost.* P. 47

Can any Ranter talk at a madder rate? Read but *Matth. 5.* and then believe this wretched assertion if you can: could *S. Paul* be of his mind when he said, *Rom. 2. 13.* not the *bea-rers* of the Law are just before God, but the *Doers* of the Law shall be justified?

17. He saith, that *in Heaven there shall not be in us only a likeness to, but the very nature of God.* P. 63

For this he cites (as hath been shewed) that of the Apostle, *Heirs of God.* That is *Heirs of his nature or substance.* Here is Blasphemy with a witness!

18. He saith, *the dictates of humane nature are never urged in the New Testament, but in order to shew men they have forgotten to act as men.* P. 72.

That is, they are not urged that they may be obeyed, and yet almost all the precepts of the Gospel are *dictates of humane nature.* He himself saith somewhere, that *trust in God* is one, and so are *love to God and our neighbour, humility, meekness, patience, purity, &c.* all such, as we are told are our duty by the dictates of nature. Never did wicked creature more industriously set himself to make the Gospel precepts mere *insignificant and vain things.*

19. Whereas Christ is called a *Prince* and a *Saviour*, he thus interprets it, *that is a Prince as a Saviour, because the righteousness*

righteousness by which he saves, beareth rule in Heaven and Earth.

P. 77

I want words to express my amazement at, and detestation of his, as *senseless* as *wicked* perverting this place, to make it favour his Ranting doctrine. Thus Reader thou seest he is as good at abusing and wresting of Scripture as of Mr. F's words; God grant that his timely repentance may prevent his doing it to his own destruction.

20. He saith, that the obedience or inclination to obedience that is, before faith, or the understanding of the Gospel, is so far from being an excellent preparative, or good qualification for faith, and the knowledge of the Gospel, that in its own nature, which is more than in its consequences, it is a great obstruction thereunto.

P. 96

Still like himself, a blessed faith, that must be in the mean time that is obstructed by a readiness to obey whatsoever God reveals; and would the Reader see what his Faith is, let him go back to page 17. of his book; there (as hath been shewn.)

21. He saith, God hath forgiven him that is enabled to believe, (and what is it, with him to believe? he tells you in the next words) that is to trust to, and venture the Eternal concerns of his Soul upon the righteousness, that is no where to be found but in the person of the son of God.

P. 17

This is all, and as much as any one can expect from him.

22. He saith, that for a man to confine himself only to the life of the Lord Jesus for an example, or to think it enough to make him in his life a pattern for us to follow, leaveth us through our shortness in the end, with the Devil and his Angels, for want of faith in the doctrine of Remission of Sins.

P. 108

1. How sottish is this Ranter? For faith in Christ and his whole Gospel is enjoyed as a means to bring us to the blessed state of likeness to him, as is fully proved in the Design of Christianity; and we may not once suppose, that we can obtain this likeness without that Faith.

2. But how desperately wicked is it likewise? as if a man may be damned that is exactly like Christ, and hath all that done in him, for the sake of which, Faith in Christ is required:

That is, is enabled from holy principles to perform all holy obedience. But this is another discovery of his wickedness in condemning *moral* Righteousness, and advancing only *imputative*; and I never knew a brutish creature do it like him. Nay, he cannot forbear somewhere in his book to speak contemptuously of our Saviours life, in asserting that Mr. F. hath given a mere *heathenish* account of it, where he (as is to be seen in the beginning of this Pamphlet) gives the *four Evangelists* account of it. I do assure the Reader, that this I have read in his Book, but I do not now remember the page.

Observe, that I do not call these, two and twenty *doctrines*, nor yet *distinct* assertions, for I have not (nor will I) so much trouble my self about them, as to consider to how many or few heads they may be reduced; the mere *transcribing* them must needs be trouble and discomposure enough to any man, that hath the least affection for the Gospel of Christ and true goodness. I could present not a few more, but never was horse more tired at a mill than I am at this work: and I assure the Reader, as I shall answer it at the great day, that I have been most severely just to him in this Catalogue, as he may quickly see, so far have I been from dealing with *his* Sayings, as 'tis shewn he hath dealt with Mr. *Fowlers*.

And now I conjure the followers of *him* and his Brethren, as they have any the *least* regard for their Souls, that for the future they abandon them, as those that feed their hearers with the deadliest poison instead of the sincere milk of the word, and the most wholesome food of the Gospel of Christ: I say I conjure them to avoid *such*, as they will Answer it at the dreadful day of our Saviours appearing with ten thousand of his Saints to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodlily committed, and of all the hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against *him*, against the blessed doctrines of his Glorious Gospel, and his *faithful ministers*. And now I will present you with another Catalogue of the hard speeches of this man, of whom whether he be one of St. *Judas* ungodly Sinners or no, the Reader is by this time well able to judge, or at least will be anon. A

A Catalogue of some of John Bunyan's horrible Revelings, and most Abominable Scurrilities.

1. **I**N the Title page he tells us, that the design of Mr. F's Book is proved to be nothing more than to trample under foot the blood of the Son of God, and the Idolizing of man's own Righteousness: And that he falls in with Quakers and Romanists against the Articles of the Church of England.

2. He tells Mr. F. that he hath vilely exposed the rottenness of his heart in Principles Diametrically opposite to the simplicity of the Gospel; and calls the Doctrine of his Book, open Blasphemy.

Page 1.

3. With the graces of the Spirit of God you have nothing to do.

P. 3.

4. Here are pure dictates of a brutish beastly man, that neither knows himself, nor one tittle of the word of God.

P. 5.

5. Whatsoever is brought (in your book,) and urged for the proof of this your description of holiness, it is but the abuse of Christ, &c.

P. 17.

6. Why should this Thief, &c.

P. 29.

7. How far off this man's Doctrine is, of Sinning against the Holy Ghost, let him that is wise consider.

ibid.

8. — Spit your intended venome at Christ.

P. 31.

9. In all you have yet asserted, you have shewed no other wisdom than of a Heathen, or of one that is short even of a novice of the Gospel.

P. 35.

10. — Sundry and damnable errors that like Venome drop from your pen.

ibid.

11. You have in this your discourse, put an unsufferable affront upon the Son of God, in making all his life and conversation to center and terminate in the holiness we had lost.

P. 43.

12. About all these things you are heathenishly dark; there hath not in these 150. pages one Gospel Truth been Christianly handled by you.

13. What man that ever had read, or assented to the Gospel,
but

but would have spoken more honourably of Christ than you have done? ibid.

14. *All this Villany against (I suppose it is) the Son of God ; the rest is torn out.* p.77.

15. *This is no other than barbarous Quakerism.* ibid.

16. *All others like your self being fearful and unbelieving, despise it, and wonder and perish.* Rev.20.8. Acts 13.40,41. p.80.

17. *Having broken the Head of your Leviathan.* p.85.

18. *Your great Question by which you would have all men make judgment of their Saveable or damnable estate, p. 236. is, according to your description of things, most Devilish and destructive.* p.88.

Reader, this is Mr. Fowlers great Question he refers to : *Am I sincerely willing to obey my Creator and Redeemer in all things? Do I entertain no lust in my breast? Do I heartily endeavour to have a right understanding of the holy Scriptures, and chiefly of the Gospel, in order to the bettering of my soul by them, and the direction of my life and actions according to them?*

19. He calls the Ministers of the Church of England, *The whole Gang of our Rabbling Counterfeit Clergy, who generally like the Ape, ly blowing up the glory and applause of our Trumpery ; and like the Tail, with foolish and sophistical argnings cover the filthy parts thereof.* See also p. 73. p.90.

I now appeal to *Authority*, whether this man ought to enjoy any interest in his Majesties *Toleration*, who is so far from being satisfied with his own liberty, that he falls thus foully upon not only one *Minister of the Church of England*, and a *Book licensed by Authority*, but also upon all the *Ministers of the Church together*, and likewise the *Discipline and Rites established*? And whether the letting such *Fire-brands*, and most impudent malicious *Schismatics* go unpunish't, doth not tend to the subversion of all *Government*. I say, let our *Superiours* judge of this.

20. But to proceed, he saith thus of the Design of *Christianity* ; *From the beginning to the end, from the top to the bottom it is a cursed blasphemous book ; a book that more vilifies Jesus Christ,*

Christ, than many of the Quakers themselves, P.92.

21. Had you joyned here with such as vilifie and trample upon the blood of the Lord Jesus, preferring the Snivel of their own Brains before him, you had herein but drawn your own picture, and given your Reader an Emblem of your self. P.93.

22. I tell you again, that your self is one of them, that have closely, privily and Devilishly, by your book, turned the Grace of our God into a lascivious Doctrine, bespattering it with giving liberty to looseness, and the hardning of the ungodly in wickedness; wherein if you persist, I shall not fail (may I live and know it and be helped of God (he should have said of the Devil) to do it) to discover yet farther the rottenness of your Doctrine, with the accursed tendencies thereof. P.90.

Here's a *Rabshakeh*! But with what brow can this wicked man thus accuse Mr. F's. book, when his own Conscience must needs tell him, that the *only* thing that makes him thus Spit his venome at it, is, that it's design is to take away all shadow of pretence for his filthy libertinism and mad licentious principles? And as to his *Threat*, I will only say; *Do thy worst thou fierce and fiery Bedlam, and persist in treasuring up to thy self wrath against the day of wrath, and the revelation of the Righteous judgment of God. But know that all thy wicked attempts against that Book (that all good men have a most hearty and affectionate kindness for,) or against the Author of it; and such like books and men can be no more regarded by people of but common sense and honesty, than are the Ravings of a perfect mad man.*

But I have not yet done with his Raylings, though I shall present the Reader but with a few in comparison of those I can.

23. He calls Mr. F's. doctrines his filthy errors, compiled and hoisted into the world, by his devilish design to promote Paganism against Christianity. p. 265, 266. P.96.

24. No man (proceeds he) is more brutish or Heathenish, nor so void of satisfaction about it, (that is the truth of the Gospel) nor more involved in error concerning it, than your self; being

being 1. Grossly ignorant, 2. Too highly opinionate, 3. Proud in affection, 4. Licentious, 5. A self-lover, 6. And for your blasphemy under the just judgement of God. p.102.

25. To Mr. Fowlers calling these the Divine perfections, viz. Justice and Righteousness, universal Charity, Goodness, Mercy, Patience, and all kinds of Purity; He saith, To call these the divine perfections, when they are only your own humane virtues, bespeaks you Fond, impious, and Idolatrous, &c. p.104.

26. He saith, The way of Salvation, or the Design of Christianity as prescribed by you, is none other than the errors of your own Brain, the way of death, the sum and heart of Papistical Quakerism, and is quite denied by the Lord Jesus, and by his Blessed Testament. p.109.

Once more he saith,

27. I admonish my Reader to tremble at the blasphemy of your book; and account the whole design therein to be none other, but that of an enemy to the Son of God, and salvation of the world. p.110.

And I admonish my Reader to tremble at that Religion, that encourageth such a most Hellish and Devillish Spirit; that gives mens Pens and Tongues leave to be such unruly evils, and even helps to fill them with the most deadly poison. That puts its professors upon thus persecuting Christ's Ministers for **RIGHTEOUSNES** sake, for the sake of inward and real Righteousness, without which nothing can commend a Religion; let wretched Hypocrites think never so despicably and basely of it, and inveigh never so villainously against those that promote it.

Thus thou hast seen, Reader, how this Raging wave (like his fellows in S. Jude) someth out his own shame. And let him take for an answer to all, the same that was given to his Great Master (that hath assisted him in this Employment) by Michael the Arch-Angel, Jude 9.

But one word more to this sad object of pity, and then I shall have done with him: If your Pride and Stomack will not

not suffer you to make now an *acknowledgement* of your most wicked behaviour towards Mr. F. and his Treatise, as open and publick, as you have made your *Sin*; do not so cheat your own Soul, as to hope for forgiveness upon any account whatsoever at the hands of God: which God for Christ's sake, by first qualifying you for it, bestow upon you. *Amen.*

An Abstract of several of the Excellent Propositions contained in that Tract of Mr. Baxter's, wherein he hath defended Mr. Fowlers Design of Christianity.

His 27th. Proposition.

THe Sum of Holiness and Morality, which is all one, is the Love of God as God, (including absolute Resignation and subjection) and the love of man and all things for God appearing in them, and served by them.

His 50.

Nothing is more sure in Christianity, than that Christ came into the world to seek and to save that which was lost; and to bring home straying Prodigals to God, and to destroy the works of the flesh and Devil; and to bring man back to the love and obedience of his Maker, and to cure him of his worldly love. And so that Holiness or the love of God, is the end of our Redemption, and our Faith.

Part of his 51, 52, 53.

We are pardoned what is past, that love may make us sin so no more; and justification is an antecedent means to our fuller Holiness and obedience to God, (which I have largely opened in my *Confession of Faith*.)

It is certain that justification and Sanctification go on hand in hand together, and it is a notorious error of such as say, that justification is perfect as soon as it begins.

And it is certain that Sanctification, as it is the work of God, is one part of the executive pardon of our sins; because it is the taking off of a very great penalty, which is the privation of the Spirit of Grace.

His 54.

Nothing is more injurious to Christ, than to feign that he is a Patron of Sin, or came to excuse men by free justification from obedience to their Creators law of Nature, or to make sin less odious to Mankind; seeing he dyed to redeem us from all iniquity, and to purifie to himself a peculiar people zealous of good works.

His 55.

And it is an *intolerable* Blasphemy against God, to imagine that Christ came to make the Divine Nature more friendly or reconcilable to sin, or to love complacently an ungodly person, as if he were Godly, as being such by the imputation of Christ's Righteousness to him, and to repute any man to be what he is not; to take a wicked man for a Saint, because that Christ was holy for him: whatever malicious *Papists* say, the *Protestants* abhor such Doctrine. (*Therefore John Bunyan is no Protestant.*)

His

His 56.

And as far are we from believing that Christ was a sinner, or that God ever supposed him to be a Sinner, or hated or punished him as a Sinner; or that ever *our* sin did really become *his* sin, or that God reputed it so to have been. For no false judgment can belong to God.

Part of his 57, and 58.

But we believe that Christ dyed for our sins, as a Sacrifice, Ransom, Propitiation, Attonement, &c.

And though we believe not, that God doth judge us to have done all the Righteousness that Christ did, nor to have possessed the same individual Righteousness that Christ had, (for God never erreth) nor accounteth us as Righteous as Christ himself; nor yet useth us in all respects as he would have done, if we had been as Righteous as Christ himself; nor do we think it a thing possible, that the same individual Righteousness that was in Christ (being an accident) can be in itself and really given to us, and made ours: yet do we believe that his habitual perfection, with his active Righteousness and his Sacrifice or Sufferings, all set together, and advanced in value by their conjunction with his Divine Righteousness, were the true, meritorious, procuring cause of our Pardon, Justification, Adoption, Sanctification, and Salvation, &c. And thus Christ's Righteousness is imputed and given to us; not immediately in it self, but in the effects and fruits. As a Ransome is said to be given to a Captive, because it is given for him, though strictly the Ransome is given to another, and only the *fruits* of it to him.

His 59.

Those Ignorant, Self-conceited, Contentious Teachers, that seek the reputation of Orthodox zeal in the things which they never understood, and instead of clear apprehending sound Scripture-doctrine, and plainly expounding it to the Church, do take on trust and for company, false or insignificant confounding notions, and proudly make them the instruments of their furious Censures and revilings, and of dividing the Church by raising slanders against those that presume to be wiser than they; and so by back-biting tell their hearers, how erroneous and dangerous this and that man's doctrine is, because they never had wisdom, study, and patience to understand it; such I say are the men that in all ages have been the *Fire-brands* in the Church, and zealously promoted Christ's Kingdom by dividing it, and will hardly ever have peace here themselves, nor endure their Brethrens or the Churches Peace.

His 65.

Those Churches especially that lament the laps of Discipline, and the confounding of the holy and profane; and those that are constituted by unwarrantable Scrutinies after the holiness of Members, beyond the test that was appointed by Christ, should not dishonour themselves, nor bring their doctrine or persons into suspicion by being the hasty Censurers and condemners of such writings, as drive harder for the promoting of holiness than themselves.

His 67.

He knoweth not the hurtful miscarriages of our times, who knoweth not what the mistaken notions about *free-grace* have done against *free-grace* it self; and how the Gospel hath been

been supplanted, by an erroneous crying up the Gospel, and crying down the Law; and how justification hath been abused by men seeming to extol it; and sanctification injured by such pretexts. And he that with one eye looks on that disease and its effects, and with the other looks on the Book you tell me of (viz. *The Design of Christianity*) and such like, will quickly see what Sore this Plaister was provided for, and how much excellent matter there is in it, which the aforesaid Persons and diseases need.

Part of his 69.

And as to Mr. *Fowler's* Confectaries (or *Inferences*) ch. 20. 22, 23. what would you wish more accommodate to an honest concord, (which is our strength and beauty) and to the healing of deforming and destroying abuses, than the practising the motion, that our union be placed in things necessary to holiness, &c.

Whose judgment Reader, dost thou think is to be preferred concerning these *Inferences*, whether this worthy able Divine, or poor J. B's. (who makes a very Turk of Mr. *Fowler* upon the account of them?)

Part of his last Proposition.

To conclude, undoubtedly *Holiness* is the life and beauty of the Soul; The Spirit of Holiness is Christ's agent to do his work in us, and our Pledg and earnest and first Fruit of Heaven: It is Christ's work, and subordinately ours, to cleanse us from all filthiness of flesh and Spirit, &c. Christ, the Spirit, the Word, the Ministry, mercies, afflictions, and all things are to bring home our hearts to God, and to work together for our good, by making us partakers of his Holiness. Our Holiness is our Love of God who is most holy: And our Love of God, and reception of his Love, is our Heaven and everlasting Happiness.

Thus

Thus thou seest, Reader, that if Mr. Fowler be so Devilish a wretch as J. B. makes him, this Learned Divine may shake hands with him.

Matt. 23. 16, 24, 26, 27, 28.

Wo unto you ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a Camel.

Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the Cup and Platter, that the outside of them may be clean also.

Wo unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, &c. Ye outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of Hypocrisie and Iniquity.

Matt. 15. 14.

And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.

2 Tim. 3. 8. 9.

Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: Men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the Faith. But they shall proceed no further: for their folly shall be manifest unto all men, as theirs also was. Read also the foregoing verses.

THE END.

